


Cambridge Bible
for
Schools and Colleges



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

*THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE
FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES*

GENERAL EDITOR FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT :—

R. ST JOHN PARRY, D.D.

FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE

THE EPISTLE

TO THE

HEBREWS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

C. F. CLAY, MANAGER

LONDON : FETTER LANE, E.C. 4



NEW YORK : THE MACMILLAN CO.

BOMBAY

CALCUTTA } MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

MADRAS }

TORONTO : THE MACMILLAN CO. OF

CANADA, LTD.

TOKYO : MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Bible
Comment. (N.T.)
Heb.
N

THE EPISTLE
TO THE

HEBREWS

In the Revised Version
With Introduction and Notes

by
A. NAIRNE, D.D.

Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge

169105.

7. 2. 22.

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1921

PREFACE

BY THE GENERAL EDITOR

THE General Editor does not hold himself responsible, except in the most general sense, for the statements, opinions, and interpretations contained in the several volumes of this Series. He believes that the value of the Introduction and the Commentary in each case is largely dependent on the Editor being free as to his treatment of the questions which arise, provided that that treatment is in harmony with the character and scope of the Series. He has therefore contented himself with offering criticisms, urging the consideration of alternative interpretations, and the like; and as a rule he has left the adoption of these suggestions to the discretion of the Editor.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

December, 1920.

PREFACE

IN this edition of the Epistle to the Hebrews the Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges has been adapted for the use of those who do not know Greek. Of the Introduction Part I (Plan and analysis) remains unaltered: Part III (Theology of the Epistle) is almost unaltered: Part II (History of the reception, criticism and interpretation of the Epistle) has been shortened and simplified, perhaps less drastically than some might wish: Parts IV and V (Text and style) have been run together into a quite simple sketch. In the Commentary the Titles and Paraphrases of the sections into which the Epistle is divided remain unaltered: the Notes have been revised, often rewritten; Greek words have been entirely cut out, and though the original Greek text is still referred to pretty constantly all is explained in as plain English as could be managed. The long Introduction, especially Part III, and the Paraphrases were intended to lighten the notes in the Greek edition: Introduction and Paraphrases were to shew what the Epistle meant, its purpose, its underlying faith; the Notes were to elucidate particular points, especially of language, and to make the Paraphrases more intelligible. This general plan still shapes the English edition. I believe that this will encourage the student, better than many and long notes would, to pay attention to the text itself of the Epistle: and I hope it may prove the more interesting method of study. I have tried to make the whole book interesting and still, in this

new form, to keep it so. I am, of course, far from counting on success in this endeavour: revision of the earlier book reveals dulness as well as a myriad of other failures to its author, who is however glad to be thus allowed to attempt correction. But I have still aimed at rousing interest: and for that reason have not been too anxious to be easy. I have kept in view as my reader an intelligent sixth form boy. In former days such a boy was reading Thucydides and Aeschylus: it may be supposed that his modern studies require no less enthusiasm and diligence. If so, he will not thank a commentator on the Greek Testament for treating him as a child. And indeed the signs of these times do seem to shew that schools and colleges, teachers and learners, are putting away childish things in their study of Holy Scripture, and are no longer content to "get up" a book of the New Testament but desire to reach the mind and faith of its author, to comprehend something of the ardour and profundity of the first age.

ALEXANDER NAIRNE.

December, 1920.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	
I. Plan and analysis of the epistle .	ix
II. History of the reception, criticism and interpretation of the epistle .	xix
III. The theology of the epistle .	xlix
IV. The style and text of the epistle .	cxv
TEXT AND NOTES.	I
INDEX	II3

INTRODUCTION

I

PLAN AND ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE

THE aim of this division of the Introduction is to set forth as plainly as possible the argument and intention of the epistle. For this purpose three summaries are given: (1) an outline sketch of the plan, (2) an enlargement of this in detailed analysis, (3) a very brief rhetorical paraphrase. All three are coloured by the view adopted in this commentary of the circumstances out of which the epistle arose. Their proper place would be at the end of the critical and theological enquiries which recommend that view. But it may make for clearness if the results are shortly stated first.

PRELUDE

The epistle is a *word of exhortation* (xiii. 22): to what does it exhort? To right conduct in an approaching crisis in which the readers must choose whether or no they will be faithful to their Lord. Such faithfulness must rest on a right conception of the Person and work of Christ. Hence Doctrine is *interwoven* with Exhortation. But i.—x. 18 is mainly doctrinal, x. 19—xiii. mainly practical; though xi. is intermediate, since *faith* partakes of both doctrine and practice, and is the affection which makes argument convincing. The author would hardly claim to have absolutely proved his doctrine by logical process, but he knows that the proof will be completed for his friends *if they will trust their Lord and follow Him where He is leading them now*.

The crisis will include persecution, abandonment of ancient forms of ritual, of ties of friendship, even of what seem to be the claims of honour, and if the right choice is made will

result in actual entrance upon the complete Christian state, i.e. entrance into the very presence of God.

Hence it must be shewn that Christ has passed through suffering and death, and, according to the analogy of the ancient ritual, has opened the way to the presence of God, i.e. that He is the one true Priest who through death **has** offered the eternal sacrifice of life; and withal His Person must be displayed in such a light as to win affection and be a proper object of devoted faith.

All this is summed up in the concluding Collect, xiii. 20, 21.

[If we may suppose the epistle written from a Jewish Christian in Italy to his friends (a family rather than a church) in Palestine, just before the breaking out of the Jewish war with Rome, its significance would seem to be particularly clear. But even though this must be considered unproven, still it will be necessary to recognise as its background an approaching crisis of a *very severe character* in which the readers will be obliged to make a brave and painful choice.]

Analysis is rendered difficult by the compression of the writer's thought—the style is severe rather than rhetorical; by our want of familiarity with the pre-supposed habits of his readers' minds, which compels a certain amount of *filling in*; and by his method of interweaving the divisions of his subject, allowing no visible articulations. The larger divisions are: i.—iv. Preparatory; v.—x. 18, Priesthood, subdivided into v.—vii. the High Priest, viii.—x. 18, the Sacrifice; x. 19—xiii. Exhortation, subdivided into two parts by xi., on Faith, which clinches the preceding argument and introduces the final Exhortation.

All through the idea rules that Jesus is the Forerunner. He has entered the presence of God, the heavenly sanctuary; the readers of the epistle have not yet followed Him thither—the crisis, their choice, must first be passed: but they are in an increasingly close relationship to Him as they follow the argument of the epistle. This is made vivid by three illustrations: the ship, vi. 19, 20; the race-course, xii. 1, 2; the sacrifice outside the camp, xiii. 10—16.

The ancient Hebrew idea of sacrifice must be kept in mind,

i.e. that the blood sprinkled was a symbol, not of death, but of life set free by death and thus presented to God.

The quotations from the Old Testament are not made arbitrarily, but according to the principle that those who were called Christs (*christos, anointed*) in the Old Testament, whether kings, prophets, priests, or even the people of Israel as a whole, were really Christs, or *in* THE CHRIST; they represented God to man and man to God. The eternal Son, whom the faithful call THE CHRIST or CHRIST (as a proper name), took as His inheritance and fulfilled all that was adumbrated in them.

SKETCH

I—IV. Preparatory to the main theme.

- i.—ii. 4. The Son's inheritance as declared in Old Testament references to Israel's king and people and to the world's Creator,
- ii. 5—18. and as displayed in the glorified humiliation of the earthly life of Jesus.
- iii.—iv. The unity of man with God through the Christ, whose office Jesus the Son of God has inherited, fulfilling its inherent high-priestly efficacy by His ascension after suffering.

V—X 18. Doctrinal theme: the Eternal High Priest.

V—VII, *The Priest*: VIII—X 18, *His Sacrifice*.

- v. 1—10. The Christ-priest satisfies the conditions of priesthood by His sympathy in suffering and by His appointment according to the order of Melchizedek.
- v. 11—vi. 20. Argument broken by warning and encouragement, but brought in again by reference in vi. 20 to this order of Melchizedek,
- vii. which signifies the Priesthood of eternal life.
- viii. Its sacrifice belongs to the promised New Covenant:

- ix. is offered once for all in the heavenly sanctuary, and by a true outpouring of blood has been effectual for remission of sins:
- x. 1-18. effectual indeed for absolute perfecting of worshippers, since it is the personal offering of that free will which is the meeting-point of spiritual beings.
- X 19—XIII. **Exhortation to use the Entrance, thus inaugurated by the High Priest**, in the one way—like His own—which is at this very time appointed.
 - x. 19-39. Therefore enter the sanctuary after Jesus, not shrinking from His own painful way. You will not, for yours is the life of faith:
 - xi. the reality of which is proved by history.
 - xii. Endure therefore, even though heaven as well as earth is to be shaken:
 - xiii. 1-17. actually overtaking the Forerunner in what seems on earth to be His ignominious position outside the camp.
 - 18-25. That you may do just this, the writer (who has done it) prays.

ANALYSIS

I—IV.

- i. 1-4. God has spoken in one who is a Son, heir of all: who being eternal and divine has become man, offered sacrifice for sins, and ascended to the right hand of God, taking His inheritance:
 - 5-14. which is Manhood joined to Godhead; not the state of the angels, for He has inherited all that was said in the Old Testament of anointed men and of God in manifestation.
- i. 1-4. Parenthetical exhortation, in which the author shews that he speaks of Him whom the faithful call The Lord.

- 5-9. The Manhood—its glory in humiliation—is displayed by comparison of the promise of glory for man and the actual life of Jesus on earth.
- 10-18. This was the fitting way for their Brother (Old Testament name inherited) to set men free from fear of death, and so by triumph over death and by sympathy to become their High Priest.
- iii. 1-5. This manhood, however, is not merely that of one man among many, as even Moses was, but corresponds to and fulfils the manhood of the anointed representatives of the ancient people (who were called sons by God); as Christ He is head of the whole house and one with its Founder:
 - 6. which house consists of the faithful.
- iii. 7-iv. 13. Exhortation to such faithfulness, which exhortation leads through the quotation from Ps. xcv. to the explanation of three principles in understanding the Old Testament:
 - (a) iii. 7-iv. 2. much is there said which has never been satisfied till these later days;
 - (β) iv. 3-10. the description of heavenly things such as the Rest of God gives the reality which earthly things suggest;
 - (γ) iv. 11-13. sincerity of conscience is necessary for the right reading of God's Word.
- iv. 14-16. Into this Rest of God Jesus of the Old Testament did not lead the people, but Jesus the Son of God has passed into it, and stands therefore confessed the true High Priest: since the function of the high priest is to provide access to God for the people whom he represents, and Jesus has already been shewn to be the true representative of man. The section ends with exhortation: "*Let us draw near.*"

V—X 18.

V—VII

- v. 1-4. As every high priest must be sympathetic and duly appointed:
- 5-6. so the Christ: for the Christ of the Old Testament, the King of Israel, was divinely addressed not only as Son, but also as Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek:
- 7-10. and the Son of God, who inherited these Old Testament appellations; sufficiently manifested His sympathy by the process of His suffering.
- v. 11-vi. 3. Rebuke; vi. 4-8, Warning; 9-12, Encouragement, followed by
- vi. 13-20. declaration of the assurance afforded by God's promise, and of the earnest of its fulfilment in Jesus' entrance within the veil.
- [Illustration: ship outside harbour; anchor touching ground; Captain already ashore.]
- vii. 1-3. Melchizedek a representation (as sketched in the Old Testament) of the eternal High Priest, the Son of God:
- 4-10. a greater priest than Aaron:
 - such as our Lord has exactly shewn Himself to be,
- 11-14. inasmuch as, being sprung from another tribe than Aaron's, namely the royal tribe of Judah,
- 15-19. having filled up the ancient sketch by the power of an indissoluble life,
- 20-22. and having been appointed by the oath of God,
- 23-25. He ever liveth to make priestly intercession.
- 26-28. This conclusion is confirmed by our sense of fitness: just such a High Priest were we needing.

VIII—X 18.

viii. 1-13. After repeating the chief point of the preceding argument—that we have a High Priest who has entered heaven itself and God's actual presence (1, 2), the author goes on to consider that He must offer a true heavenly sacrifice (3-6), and points out that a new and real Covenant had been promised, the Covenant in fact of which the true High Priest is Mediator (7-12), and that this implies the disappearance of the Old in the New (13).

ix. 1-5. Description of the old ritual, which
6-10. provided no real access to God's presence, and was to last only till a time of reformation.

11-14. Description of the new ritual of the true Sanctuary, Victim, and Priest, in which eternal redemption and cleansing of conscience has been provided.

15-17. And as the old ritual, according to the ancient idea of a Covenant,

18-22. involved death by representation:

23-28. so does the new ritual involve suffering, but through suffering the manifestation of abiding life.

x. 1-4. The old rule of ritual has a shadow of hope, and repeats a memorial of sins:

5-10. but Jesus Christ, the sacrificing Priest who has passed through earthly life to heavenly, has made a real offering, in which we have been really consecrated, for it is the offering of Himself made of His own free will,

11-14. and needing no repetition, for it is complete;

15-18. and hence the prophetic promise has been fulfilled; remission of sins has taken place; the only barrier is removed.

X 19—XIII.

- x. 19-25. *Enter* then by the way, fresh-slain yet living, the painful way of the flesh of Jesus Christ, into the true sanctuary, not forsaking the appointed methods of worship; the consolations of worship and fellowship are real to those who recognise the unseen power which is carrying on the succession of events to the appointed *Day*.
- 26-31. For so it is indeed; we know the truth of things, and there is no other religion to take the place of ours; we dare not despise it.
- 32-34. Nor will you: your former constancy must be renewed.
- 35-39. The Day is at hand: *He* comes, as the ancient warning says; surely the ancient *Faith* is ours.
- xi. 1-2. And that there is such a power as Faith is proved
3. by our own intelligent observation of the course of history,
- 4-39. and by the witness borne to our forefathers, who ever looked into the unseen and chose the braver course,
40. and now wait for us to realise with them the promise they trusted.
- xii. 1-3. And they, witnesses themselves to faith's reality and power, are watching us as we strip for our contest.
- [Illustration: a race-course; the readers of the epistle are stripping to run; at the end of the course they can see Jesus who has run the race before them, and whom, as they run, they will approach.]
- 4-13. Endure chastisement as being yourselves sons: shrink not even from extreme suffering.

- 14-17. Live at peace with all if you can; but do not, for the sake of peace, impair your consecration, as Esau, for the sake of ease, sold his birthright.
- 18-29. For the coming crisis is supreme: at Sinai Israel could not endure God's voice; but then matters were transacted in the shadowy sphere of earth, now for good or ill you touch the heavenly city: even what seem heavenly realities are to be shaken now, but in the very endurance of this terror we are receiving a Kingdom which cannot be shaken: for this let us with grateful hearts do our priestly service to God who purifies by fire.
- xiii. 1-3. Exhortation to love of the brethren: 4, honour of marriage; 5-6, contentment:
- 7-16. holding fast to the traditional order of the society of the faithful by remembering their deceased rulers (7); celebrating the unchanging sacrifice of Jesus Christ, to whom they can actually draw near [here the *illustration* from the old sacrificial ritual passes from illustration into *fact*] by going out of the ancient camp and joining in that real, heavenly sacrifice, which from the view of it presented now on earth appears less as a sacrifice than as the off-scouring of a sacrifice;
17. and by obeying their present rulers.
- 18-19. Exhortation to prayer for the writer, followed by
- 20-21. his prayer for them: that they may be enabled by God who creates peace in the midst of tumult to make the right choice in the approaching crisis,—even as the writer himself has already made his choice, and henceforth acquiesces in the divine

purpose—through Jesus the exalted Christ, who passed in an exercise of His will, which is our pattern, through death to the glory of His High Priesthood.

22-25. Farewell and greetings.

RHETORICAL PARAPHRASE

Son of God, Christ: who is He whom we thus name and who has inherited such great titles from Israel's heroes?

One who seems far lowlier than they. But His glory was revealed in humiliation, and His humiliation was the means of His high-priestly sympathy with men.

For He shared their trials that, priest-like, He might bring them to God.

Think of Him as High Priest and you will never give Him up. Hold fast to Him in your approaching trial and you will know what His priestly salvation really is.

As High Priest: but not in the mechanical line of Aaron. That shadowy ordinance is fading ineffectually away before our eyes. Rather as High Priest in that eternal line of world-wide ancestry and living growth which the Psalmist symbolically named "after the order of Melchizedek."

Jesus, our Lord, standing on the Godward side of all men, and sacrificing His life for love of men, is the evident fulfiller of all that line of loving priestly life which has been throughout all history the visible sacrament of Godhead on earth.

Believe then that He as High Priest has opened the way for you to the presence of God.

The visible shame of Calvary was the sacrament of His entrance into the sanctuary of God's presence on our behalf. It remains for us to make the sacrament our own and to follow Him.

Remember your courage in former trials. Imitate the courageous faith of your forefathers. Follow Jesus your

acknowledged Lord in the course He has run before you—do that hard duty which is now specially set before you.

Break old ties. Go forth to Him outside the camp. Enter the city of God.

Following Jesus you shall be united with the Christ.

II

HISTORY OF THE RECEPTION, CRITICISM AND INTERPRETATION OF THE EPISTLE

IN the third century Hebrews seems to have been read at Alexandria as one of the epistles of S. Paul. That was the popular use which we know only through the Alexandrine scholars who criticised it. These scholars perceived that the epistle could not have been written by S. Paul, but might be connected more or less closely with his teaching. The loose ascription to S. Paul as ultimate source which they allowed spread into a general recognition of its Pauline authorship in the East from the fourth century onwards, and by degrees the Western Church acquiesced.

Yet not whole-heartedly. The primitive tradition in the West had been clear against Pauline authorship. In Rome it had been denied. In Africa Tertullian had quoted the epistle as Barnabas'. This primitive tradition was obscured from the fifth century, when S. Jerome advocated the Eastern opinion, and onward through the middle ages. But it was never quite forgotten, and at the revival of learning in the sixteenth century it was still there, ready to be harmonised with the recovered appreciation of the distinctive subject and character of the epistle.

In the West, its first home, men knew Hebrews was not Paul's. In the East the easy habit grew of classing it among Pauline epistles. Whenever the peculiar message of this epistle was discerned that easy habit was criticised. There is the story in brief which must now be set out in some detail.

§ 1. *At Alexandria a tradition of Pauline authorship was criticised by scholars in the second century, but by the fourth century it prevailed and spread over the East: Clement, Origen, Athanasius.*

Eusebius in the sixth book of his Ecclesiastical History (*H. E.* vi. 14) quotes from the Hypotyposeis of Clement of Alexandria (c. 200): "Paul, as the blessed presbyter used to say, did not put his name, as apostle, to this letter, since the Lord, the apostle of Almighty God, had been sent as apostle to the Hebrews. It was a matter of reverence, and because this letter lay outside his commission as apostle to the Gentiles." From *H. E.* v. 11, vi. 13, it is reasonable to suppose that "the blessed presbyter" was Pantaenus, Clement's predecessor in the Catechetical School of Alexandria. He used to explain in this way the difficulty presented by the abrupt opening of the epistle, and the absence of the author's name and title throughout.

But there were other difficulties to be faced; and one, the peculiar style, was felt by Clement. After saying that Paul wrote in Hebrew and Luke translated, whence comes the likeness in style to Acts, Clement goes on to explain that Paul kept back his name because the Hebrews were prejudiced against him, and so "very cleverly he did not repel them at first start by putting his name." This "at first start," makes us think of a converse piece of modern criticism in Wrede's *Das literarisch Rätsel des Hebräerbriefs*, who, denying Pauline authorship, thinks the conclusion a later addition by some one who wished to pass the epistle off as a letter of Paul's. Did Clement mean that the readers would perceive who was writing to them when they reached those intimate and affectionate messages? Probably not. Clement does not appear to have gone beneath the surface in his criticism and perhaps never felt how near he came to impugning the good faith of S. Paul.

Pantaenus criticised simply, yet profoundly; Clement slightly. His successor Origen has the sure touch, far sight, and caution of a real scholar, but is characteristically himself in the way he uses his scholarship; like Pantaenus, he is

carried by his reverence near to the heart of the problem. Eusebius has preserved two fragments from his Homilies on the epistle (*H. E.* vi. 25), to this effect: "In his sermons on the epistle to the Hebrews Origen thus discusses its authorship and authority. He says that every one capable of distinguishing styles would acknowledge Hebrews to be quite different from the style of S. Paul. S. Paul was as he told the Corinthians (2 Cor. xi. 6) 'rude in speech,' and Hebrews is what may be called good Greek. On the other hand, anyone who read S. Paul's epistles diligently would agree that the theology of this truly wonderful epistle is on the same high canonical level as S. Paul's." He adds that "if I were to declare my own opinion I should say that the theology is Paul's, but the actual composition of the letter has been entrusted to some one who took notes, like a pupil at his master's lectures, of Paul's ideas and then wrote them out in his own way. So then if a church like ours at Alexandria holds the epistle to be Paul's, let it not be blamed, even though it connects the document more closely with the apostle than I do: for it really was (as I have just shewn) with reason that an elder generation has handed down the letter as simply 'Paul's.' But to speak accurately, Paul did not write the letter himself: who did, God only knows, though critical enquiry, so far as it has gone as yet, has suggested Clement, the friend of Paul who afterwards became bishop of Rome, or Luke the writer of the Gospel and the Acts, as in some sense the writer of Hebrews."

Origen witnesses to a tradition of Pauline authorship in the Alexandrine Church without denying or affirming that it may be found in some other churches. He recognises a moderate antiquity for this tradition. He is sure himself that the letter was not composed by S. Paul, but he is also sure that it is worthy to be ranked with S. Paul's writings as a primary source of Christian theology. That being so he is not much interested in the question of authorship; a church may harmlessly quote the letter as Paul's, and he himself used to do so, as we learn from his other writings. In all this he is near to modern criticism. The difference is that he seems to recognise a closer connexion with S. Paul than most

modern critics would allow. This however is the main point. We find at Alexandria a firm conviction of the canonicity of Hebrews and of its great value; and a vague tradition of its Pauline authorship, which we only hear of because the competent judges at Alexandria criticised it. On the other hand, Alexandria accounts for the later general acceptance of the Pauline authorship; Origen's acquiescence in the habit of quoting the epistle loosely as S. Paul's encouraged its continuance, and it spread abroad. And yet perhaps that encouragement was hardly needed. It was the Alexandrine recognition of canonicity that influenced the future. Origen was great enough to distinguish inspiration from reverence for an apostle's name. Others were less bold. And when the epistle stood firmly established in the Canon of the Eastern Church Pauline authorship became a necessary inference.

§ 2. *There is no primitive evidence for such a tradition in the East generally: Irenaeus, Eusebius, Versions.*

But this came later. Even in the Eastern Church there is no evidence, outside Alexandria, for any early belief that the epistle was written by S. Paul. Irenaeus was bishop of Lyons in Gaul, but he was by birth a Greek of Asia Minor, and may be considered a witness to the Eastern tradition of the second century. It seems quite certain that Irenaeus did not reckon Hebrews among the epistles of S. Paul. Eusebius, who was bishop of Caesarea, does fall in with the new custom in the chapter in which he expressly declares what the Canon of Scripture is, *H. E.* III. 25; for he enters therein, after the Gospels and Acts, "the epistles of Paul," without considering it necessary to say how many there are, and he does not name Hebrews, or any other epistle attributed to S. Paul, among the disputed books which he presently catalogues. But in *H. E.* VI. 13 he does use this very term "disputed," of Hebrews together with the Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Barnabas, Clement, and Jude, and he was of course aware of the ancient objections. Moreover in *H. E.* III. 37, when he is writing about the epistle of Clement and his mind is thereby brought to consider frankly the problem of authorship, he adopts as his own the Alexandrine mediating explanation:

Clement's use of the epistle shews that it was not a new work in his day; hence it has been decided that it should be included in the Pauline list; no doubt Paul communicated with the Hebrews in his native language, Luke or Clement (whose epistle resembles Hebrews in style) interpreted his writing.

Such was the reputable opinion of an ecclesiastical scholar just before the Council of Nicaea. At that Council Hebrews was quoted as written by S. Paul, but no discussion of the Canon of Scripture was held (Westcott, *Canon*, p. 430). It is however from this period that Hebrews definitely takes its place among the Pauline epistles. Athanasius, in his *Festal Letter* for the year 367, may be held to have declared the settled opinion of the Eastern Church. In this letter he gives a list of the canonical Scriptures, in which, after Acts and the seven Catholic epistles, he enumerates the fourteen epistles of S. Paul, placing Hebrews between the two to the Thesalonians and the Pastorals; these are followed by Philemon, which concludes the list. Possibly the form of expression "that"—not "one"—"to the Hebrews" was intended to stand as a memorial of superseded doubt.

The order is interesting. It is familiar to us to-day because Westcott and Hort have adopted it in their Greek Testament from the great uncial mss. It was perhaps derived from Alexandria. If popular Alexandrine usage was the source of the tradition of Pauline authorship, Alexandria was also the place where that tradition was restrained by scholarship. From Alexandria a modified judgement about authorship, and a modified position in the Pauline list, were promulgated to the Eastern Church. The order of our English version, Hebrews last of all, comes to us from the Vulgate. It is Western, and reflects the never quite forgotten objection to Pauline authorship in the Latin Church.

The Syriac versions may be appealed to for the liturgical practice of the Eastern Church of the Euphrates valley of which the metropolis was Edessa. The later Syriac Bible, the Peshitta, contains Hebrews. But the question is, did the Old Syriac include it? And that question cannot be answered for we have the Old Syriac only in the Gospels now. What it certainly did not contain, any more than the Egyptian

versions did, was the Apocalypse. S. Jerome wrote to Dardanus that whereas the use of the Latins (in his day) was to exclude Hebrews, while the churches of the Greeks excluded the Apocalypse, he followed the authority of the ancient writers and accepted both as canonical. We will consider presently what this testimony precisely signifies. Meanwhile it is enough to note that he somewhat misunderstood the authority of the ancient writers. Speaking roughly we might say that the earlier evidence shews Hebrews received in the East and not in the West, Apocalypse in the West not in the East; that is, each was suspected in that region where it was probably composed. But for Hebrews, at any rate, even this partial acceptance must be qualified. Only at Alexandria in quite early times does anything like a tradition of Pauline authorship appear, and at Alexandria we only know it because it was criticised. Nor does criticism cease in the East even when the "use" becomes fixed. Euthalius (c. 460) still has to defend his "use" against the old obstinate questionings, and it is interesting to find that one of the arguments in his defence is drawn from the false reading in x. 34, "my bonds." Satisfaction with the Pauline claim grows up side by side with the textual and exegetical blurring of the individual character of the epistle.

§ 3. *In Africa Tertullian quotes the epistle as Barnabas', and approves it as excluding second repentance.*

In the West meanwhile there is no hint of any one reading Hebrews as S. Paul's. Tertullian at the beginning of the third century quotes it in the tract *de Pudicitia*, c. 20. Here Tertullian names Barnabas as author. He seems to have no doubt about this, but it is not therefore certain that he witnesses to the African tradition. Zahn supposes him to have found the epistle so described in a ms. that came from some Greek church, and this is the more likely in that the rendering he gives is very different from any form of the Old Latin known to us, and appears to be his own. On the whole it seems probable that there is no more value in the reference preserved by Tertullian to Barnabas than in those of Alexandria to Clement or Luke. Those were the guesses of a

literary church where style was considered; this was the guess of a simpler society which only noticed the subject-matter and argued that the Levite of the New Testament was likely to be the author of the epistle which dealt with priesthood.

What Tertullian does prove is that he had no idea of the epistle being S. Paul's, and that he rather wishes than asserts its canonical authority. He valued it highly, but only because it is faithful to what he believed to have been the primitive apostolic discipline of penitence. He read it and the rest of the New Testament in what till lately would have been thought his own masterful way: but, as will presently appear, one of the latest editors of Hebrews agrees with him that "no second repentance" is the actual doctrine of the epistle. The newest rule of interpretation is the same as that of the African master in the second century.

§ 4. *At Rome Clement quotes Hebrews in first century, but says nothing about authorship. Close connexion of his epistle with Hebrews throughout, and possible dependence of both on Roman liturgical use. Clement generalises doctrine of Hebrews.*

But not the same as that of the earliest reader known to us, Clement of Rome, the first "doctor" of the Church, whose motto was "intense moderation." He puts no straiter limits to repentance than our Lord does in the Gospels, nor does it seem to occur to him that such limits are prescribed in this epistle or in any other part of the New Testament.

For the present however our business is with Clement as witness to Rome's early knowledge of the epistle, and in particular Rome's knowledge that S. Paul was not the author of it.

The letter sent from the Roman Church to the Corinthian Church, where quarrels had arisen concerning the ministry, bears no writer's name. Early tradition tells us that it was written by Clement, the third bishop of Rome after the apostles, the successor, that is, of Linus and Cletus or Anencletus, and that it was written at the end of the reign of Domitian, about 95 A.D. This fits well with the indications of date afforded by the document itself, which refers to an

earlier persecution (i.e. Nero's) and to one which was raging or had but just ceased when it was written. This date corresponds with Clement's position in the episcopal succession, and we may safely accept both name and date, in spite of the critics—some of them acute—who have placed the document either earlier (in the reign of Nero) or later (in the reign of Trajan or of Hadrian).

In ch. xxxvi. of this letter Clement writes:

This is the way, beloved, in which we found our salvation, Jesus Christ the high priest of our offerings, the champion who helps our infirmity. Through him let us look steadfastly unto the heights of heaven. Through him we see as in a mirror his pure and sublime countenance. Through him the eyes of our heart were opened. Through him our dull and darkened mind springs up into his marvellous light. Through him the divine Sovereign willed that we should taste immortal knowledge: Who being the effulgence of his majesty is by so much greater than angels as he hath inherited a more excellent name. For it is thus written:

Who maketh his angels winds
And his ministers a flame of fire.

But of his Son thus saith the divine Sovereign:

Thou art my Son,
This day have I begotten thee.
Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen as thine inheritance,
And the ends of the earth as thy possession.

And again he saith of him:

Sit thou on my right hand,
Till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet.

Here are quotations introduced by reminiscences. Such reminiscences abound in the letter. The writer is soaked in the language of Hebrews. No wonder the early critics thought of him as in some sense the author of Hebrews. But he has not the air of one quoting from himself. Moreover his thought is often quite different from the thought of Hebrews. In particular the great ideas of Blood and Sacrifice in Hebrews appear indeed in Clement but appear transformed. In Hebrews the Blood is sacrificial: it is the life given to cleanse and renew life: in Clement (as generally in S. Paul) it is a metaphor for Christ's redeeming death. In Hebrews,

except in one place, xiii. 16, sacrifice or offering is used in the singular of the one supreme sacrifice in which Christ offered himself and thereby opened the way to the presence of God and wrought salvation. In Clement these terms are commonly in the plural; it is the lesser idea of Heb. xiii. 16 which he adopts; often by the offerings he means the alms and oblations of the congregation.

Clement is highly eucharistic, liturgical. His letter ends with a noble litany and thanksgiving in which it is generally supposed he repeats the customary language of the church's worship at Rome. Hebrews has provided liturgic language for the later worship of the church, but besides that it is difficult to avoid the fancy that Hebrews too depends considerably on the early, oral, liturgic practice. May it not be that both these authors wrote from Rome; both draw consciously or unconsciously some thoughts from the eucharistic service they knew? If so their coincidences and differences tend to remind us how one aspect of a mystery is visible to one mind, another to another—so perhaps with the Christ of S. John and the earlier evangelists.

However the fancy is not to be pressed; especially with regard to Clement's witness to Hebrews. Even if some of his resemblances in word or thought might be due to a common liturgical influence, enough would still remain to satisfy us that he had read the epistle. Is it then clear that he knew it was not S. Paul's? Taking Clement by himself we cannot say so. It is not his way to name the authors he uses. He introduces quotations from the Old Testament with "It is written," or, more often (in the style of Hebrews), "God saith," "the scripture saith," "He saith somewhere": no writer of the New Testament is canonical for him in the same degree as the Old. He once refers to "the" letter of the blessed Paul the apostle (xlvi.), but that means the epistle Paul wrote to the Corinthians whom Clement himself is addressing; there was a special reason for naming him in that one place. And in ch. v. Paul is named, and from what immediately follows we might infer that Clement knew 2 Corinthians and possibly 2 Timothy, as his. But his silence about the author of the passages he quotes from Hebrews

can prove but little more than his silence about S. Peter or S. James when he makes use of the teaching which comes to us under their names.

§ 5. *Clement's witness is continued by the Western denial of Pauline authorship. Till fourth century Rome and the West do not waver: Hippolytus, Muratorian Canon, Old Latin Version. Then Jerome, Augustine, Hilary begin to adopt Eastern acceptance of Paul as author; yet still witness to contrary tradition of West, which was never wholly forgotten even in the Middle Ages: Dante; Erasmus, Estius.*

But there is another consideration, in the light of which that silence does appear more significant. Clement's witness cannot be separated from the general witness of the Church in the West which flows on from him as the starting point. That witness is against the Pauline authorship; so obstinately against it that we can hardly escape the conclusion that Rome knew S. Paul had not written the epistle. Till the fourth century Tertullian and Gregory of Elvira alone in the West make any reference to it, and both of them attribute it to Barnabas. And the silence of Novatian is particularly eloquent. If in the middle of the third century, when he was pressing the sterner discipline at Rome, there had been any idea of the Pauline authorship in the Roman Church, he would surely have appealed to Heb. vi. 4—6. But there is no reference to Hebrews in either of Novatian's extant books, nor is he anywhere said to have made such reference.

And, going back to the end of the second century, we find the Pauline authorship distinctly denied at Rome. Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 20, tells of a certain "very learned man" who wrote against the Montanists in the time of Zephyrinus, and denied that the epistle to the Hebrews is one of S. Paul's epistles. He is checking the licence of opponents in adducing new Scriptures, and seems to illustrate his argument from this parallel novelty of attributing Hebrews to the apostle. And Eusebius adds that this was natural since even down to his own time there are some in the Roman Church who do not allow this epistle to be Paul's; that is, Eusebius recognises

that this "very learned man" was supported by the tradition of his church in his plain denial.

But who is this "very learned man"? Eusebius calls him Gaius, and it is possible that there was a Gaius who was a Roman presbyter at that time; but it is certain no Gaius wrote the dialogue of which Eusebius here speaks. He has however mentioned immediately before Hippolytus "bishop of some see." Hippolytus did write that very dialogue and named the orthodox interlocutor Gaius. It was Hippolytus the "presbyter" or "venerable" bishop of the foreigners at the port of Rome who denied Hebrews to S. Paul, as Stephen Gobar and Photius distinctly say in later centuries.

The story of this remarkable person may be read in the second volume of Lightfoot's *S. Clement of Rome*, set off with all the riches of scholarship and all the charm of romance. Two points only need be touched here. "He linked together the learning and traditions of the East, the original home of Christianity, with the marvellous practical energy of the West, the scene of his own life's labours": and he was probably the author of the Muratorian Canon.

The Muratorian Canon is a document which contains a mutilated list of the books of the New Testament. It was "discovered and published by Muratori in 1740 from a ms. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan...Muratori himself attributed it to Gaius, the contemporary of Hippolytus, who flourished under Zephyrinus....It is generally allowed that this catalogue emanated from Rome, as indeed the mention of 'the city' implies....The general opinion also is that the document was written in Greek and that we possess only a not very skilful, though literal, translation." The whole of Lightfoot's § 6, pp. 405—413, should be read to appreciate his proof that Hippolytus wrote the Canon in Greek iambics, and that it is in fact the work included in the list of the saint's writings which is engraved on the chair of his third century statue, and is there called "verses on all the Scriptures." The Latin of the Canon may be found in its full and very corrupt form in Westcott's *Canon of the New Testament*, App. C. Souter, *Text and Canon of N.T.* pp. 208—211, gives it in a corrected form with textual notes.

The testimony of the document is clear to thirteen and only thirteen epistles of S. Paul. Hebrews is not named at all. But the ms. is mutilated and Hebrews may have been mentioned in the lost conclusion. An epistle is mentioned as "addressed fictitiously in the name of Paul to the Alexandrines, and bearing upon the heresy of Marcion." It is hardly possible that this should mean Hebrews. Yet "to the Alexandrines" does fit curiously its Alexandrine style and thought. Nor does "bearing upon the heresy of Marcion" seem an impossible description of a letter which appeals so much to the Old Testament and treats so deeply the real manhood of the Lord. If the identification could be upheld it would witness to a remarkable attempt in early times to appreciate the individual and original character of the epistle.

However that may be, the mention of Marcion's name serves to remind us here that the earliest list we have of S. Paul's epistles comes from Marcion, and Hebrews is not included therein. As Marcion also omits the Pastorals, it may be best to refer to this merely in passing. At the same time it must be remarked that both omissions may be evidence of great importance. It is becoming more and more clear that some of Marcion's "readings" are not, as those who wrote against him supposed, wilful alterations of the text, but valuable evidence for at least an early text. His list of the Pauline epistles is conclusive evidence for the substantial truth of the Church's tradition of S. Paul's work and writings. And his omission of Hebrews and the Pastorals may indicate that in 150 A.D. these two elements of the final New Testament Canon were still—though it may be for very different reasons, and in different degrees—excluded.

The document called the Mommsen Canon agrees with the Muratorian in omitting Hebrews and limiting the Pauline epistles to thirteen. This document was found by Theodor Mommsen in the Phillipps Library at Cheltenham in 1885, and another copy has been found since then at S. Gall. The Canon is considered to be African, of date about 360 A.D. The Latin of the New Testament part may be read in Souter, p. 212. It adds, with a faint hint of doubt, 2 and 3 John and

2 Peter to the New Testament of Cyprian the third century bishop of Carthage; otherwise it agrees with him. This makes it almost certain that in the earliest state of the Old Latin version Hebrews was not included; for that version arose in Africa where "Latin was the official language and the language of civilisation" while at Rome "society from top to bottom was bilingual" and from Paul to Hippolytus (56—230 A.D.) Christian literature was in Greek.

Yet we possess an Old Latin translation of Hebrews. That is true, but there is reason to suppose that it is either a late made one, or at least one that was "picked up" at a comparatively late period and added to the other books. Westcott says (*Canon*, p. 266) "The Claromontane text of the Epistle to the Hebrews represents I believe more completely than any other manuscript the simplest form of the *Vetus Latina*; but from the very fact that the text of this Epistle exhibits more marked peculiarities than are found in any of the Pauline Epistles, it follows that it occupies a peculiar position." And this becomes even more evident when we find interpolated in the ms. between the other Pauline epistles and Hebrews a list of New Testament books with the number of lines filled by each—a "stichometry"—in which the epistles of S. Paul are enumerated without Hebrews. At the end of the list Hermas, Acts of Paul, Apocalypse of Peter are added; and between the Catholic epistles and the Apocalypse (of John) comes "Barnabas," which seems to mean what we call "Hebrews," the correspondence in stichometry pointing to that identification. It seems clear that Codex Claromontanus was mainly copied from an earlier ms. which did not include Hebrews, but when this copy was made it was desired that Hebrews should be included. Dr Souter thinks that it was written in Sardinia after the island had become part of the Byzantine empire in the sixth century. If so, it might seem that even so late the Latin Canon in Sardinia was enlarged in deference to Eastern custom. The peculiar character of the Vulgate translation may be mainly due to its being a revision of the Old Latin which already differed so much from the Old Latin of the other epistles.

In the fourth century we do indeed find Western doctors, such as Hilary and Ambrose, quoting the epistle freely as S. Paul's. This is quite natural. There is a considerable amount of evidence for the epistle being widely known, whatever was thought about its authorship, from the earliest times. Good-hearted students would come of their own accord to Origen's opinion that the theology of Hebrews was wonderful and by no means inferior to the received canonical writings; then, as with Origen himself, the step to quoting it as "the apostle's" would be easy.

But that being so the noteworthy point is the reluctance of the Latin Church to go further. This may be illustrated at two stages: first in what the two great scholars, Jerome and Augustine, write when they deliberately consider the question; secondly in the scruples against breaking with the tradition against Pauline authorship which persist to a late period.

Full and fair quotation for the mind of Jerome and Augustine may be found in that treasury of learning which all subsequent commentators have drawn upon, Bleek's edition¹, or in the excellent adaptation of Bleek's prolegomena which Alford has made in the fourth volume of his Greek Testament. S. Jerome's "usual practice is, to cite the words of the epistle, and ascribe them to St Paul." His residence in the East might account for that. But when as a scholar he gives a critical decision he writes differently. He recognises that the Western church has never allowed the Pauline authorship. The "new learning" he has found among the Greeks inclines him to correct the Western use. What he really witnesses to is an indomitable Church tradition in the West against the Pauline authorship and even the canonical authority of Hebrews: and what he asserts is that this tradition is of late growth; the voice of antiquity is for the canonical authority, and scholars know that this, as well as the usurping tradition, can be explained by recognising that the epistle is derived, but not directly, from S. Paul. In other words he has a fairly large critical apparatus; reads its evidence with a partial misunderstanding; and leaves to

¹ *Der Brief an die Hebräer erläutert durch Einleitung, Uebersetzung und fortlaufenden Commentar.* Berlin, 1828—1840.

later generations an unmistakable proof that even in his day the unsophisticated Western churchmen held fast to the tradition of their fathers that this epistle did not come from S. Paul.

S. Augustine's feeling may be illustrated by one short quotation from *De civitate Dei*, xvi. 22: "on this subject many great things are written in the epistle entitled 'To the Hebrews,' an epistle which most people say is the apostle Paul's, but some deny that." He was less particular as a scholar than Jerome, more philosophical as a churchman, and the mere question of authorship troubled him slightly. Moreover there is evidence that in Africa in his time such scruples were falling, perhaps more entirely than elsewhere, into the background. Whereas in the third council of Carthage A.D. 398 Hebrews was distinguished from or among the Pauline epistles, in the fifth council of Carthage A.D. 419 this carefulness had ceased. And from this period onward in West as in East the fourteen epistles of S. Paul are regularly recognised.

The distinction between the question of authorship and canonical authority is important; it may well account for the considerable number of Western writers who cite Hebrews as Paul's from the middle of the fourth century onwards. Canonical authority admitted, only scholars when directly dealing with the question of authorship would separate this from the "corpus" of Pauline epistles: many would use Paul's name without scruple. Others, like Hilary of Poitiers (✠ 366), would cite the epistle, but would take care not to name Paul in connexion with it. This is the way most theologians treat it to-day.

And that attitude altered very gradually. The ancient Roman tradition was too deeply rooted to die out. Even Dante in the *De Monarchia* (ii. 8) distinguishes "Paul" or "the apostle" from the author of this epistle, introducing his one citation from it anonymously. And when in the sixteenth century the new learning gave fresh substance to the old doubts, we find writers within the Roman Church frankly reconsidering opinions which by that time had almost the prescription of authority. Thus Estius writes in the opening

section of his commentary that in former times catholic writers, especially among the Latins, did not recognise this epistle as canonical; that Eusebius classes it among those Scriptures which were controverted by many; and "finally in our own day Caietan at the beginning of his commentary throws doubt upon its authority, and says that a point of faith cannot be determined from it alone." Estius himself holds, with others, who are indeed the old Alexandrines, that the subject and its treatment were supplied by S. Paul, but the composition was entrusted to another, Clement of Rome perhaps, more likely the apostle's companion Luke. He refuses to allow that it is heresy to doubt that S. Paul was the author. The decision of the Council of Trent, by which the Epistle to the Hebrews is numbered among the fourteen epistles of S. Paul, seems only to have settled the question of its canonicity for him. Erasmus seems to promise more absolute deference to authority. "If the church defines it certainly to be Paul's I gladly bring my thoughts into captivity to the obedience of faith: my own feeling is that it does not seem to be Paul's, for reasons which I had better not mention now. And if I did know for certain that it was not Paul's, it is not worth fighting about." That was before the council had spoken, and the fairest way of interpreting both Erasmus and Estius is to suppose that on such a question the decision of a council was never intended to be an absolute bar to the exercise of criticism, however it might restrain promiscuous publication of results or tentative results.

§ 6. *And was revived at the Renaissance; when also the special doctrine of Hebrews, so long generalised, began to be recovered: Limborch and sacrifice, the Arminians.*

With Erasmus a new era began in the study of the New Testament. It is about four hundred years since Erasmus, publishing his Greek Testament, opened the Gospels and the apostolic records in their original language to the world. That gave impulse to a movement already begun. The joy of the secular renaissance had already been to recover the actual life and thought of Rome and Hellas. A yearning for the real meaning of antiquity was in men's hearts, and it was

in the hearts of Churchmen as well as other scholars. *Ad antiquitatem immo ad ultimam antiquitatem* was Lancelot Andrewes' appeal in the seventeenth century. And we recognise in the commentators of that time quite a novel effort to discover what was the immediate and particular sense of each of the apostolic writers.

Little of this had been attempted before. 'There is just a trace of it in the New Testament. At the end of 2 Peter some characteristics of the Pauline epistles are noticed. This is worth mentioning here because it has been sometimes thought that Hebrews is particularly alluded to, which seems a strange fancy. But from apostolic times till the renascence there was hardly any recognition of the individual character of epistles. Ménégos has a chapter¹ on the theological influence of the epistle in the history of dogma. He confines his attention to the main doctrine of the sacrifice of Christ, and shews that though the peculiar language of the epistle was repeated, its peculiar idea was never grasped.

In the period of the Fathers theological interest was in the Person of Christ. The Incarnation included the whole of Christ's work of salvation. And so far as His death was considered separately as the means by which man was rescued, it was thought of as a ransom—an idea natural to those days of brigandage; generally as a ransom paid to the devil, sometimes as paid to God. And though the Fathers ("apostolic" and later) adopt the term "sacrifice" from Hebrews, they use it merely as a metaphor for "ransom": "c'est le triomphe de l'image au détriment de l'idée."

After Anselm "satisfaction" instead of "ransom" became the idea round which thought moved. And still, as before, the terms of "sacrifice" were adopted from Hebrews, and still they were used as metaphors; only now, throughout the middle ages, as metaphors for "satisfaction."

The reformers accepted this doctrine from the middle ages, laying stress especially on "substitution," but still applying the sacrificial language of Hebrews in a merely metaphorical way. Calvin however took up what Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Augustine, and Aquinas had said about

¹ *La théologie de l'épître aux Hébreux* (Paris, 1894), ch. vii.

the threefold office of Christ as Prophet, Priest and King, and for two centuries the *munus triplex Christi* figured as an essential heading in protestant theology.

Ménégoz notices the unusual position taken by Abelard in the middle ages. He taught, and the doctrine is scriptural, that man was to be reconciled to God rather than God to man. And he developed this in his own way by declaring that the reconciliation is effected by the love that was revealed in the Saviour's death upon the cross; there is the moving power. Perhaps, though Ménégoz does not, we may connect the line of thought thus opened with what he says of the Arminians:

However the theology of the epistle was to find in protestantism a little corner where it might fructify. The Arminians, repelled alike by the orthodox theory of expiation and by the superficial rationalism of the Socinians, sought an interpretation of the death of Christ which might better respond to their religious feeling.... Curcellaeus laid stress upon the intercession of Christ in the presence of the Father, and scarcely considered His death but as a condition of His resurrection and ascension. The Socinians too had already brought that side of the redemptive activity of the Christ into prominence, thus approaching the views of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But it is Limborch, the great dogmatist of the Arminians, who entered most resolutely into this order of ideas.... In Limborch the notion of sacrifice obliges Christ to have died for us, but not to have suffered our punishment. His death is thus not a substitutive expiation but a sacrificial offering, graciously accepted by God. And as Christ has not only been the victim but is also the high priest for all eternity, He continues to intercede in God's presence for the sinners who have recourse to His ministry. His sacrifice has thus a permanent value.

Once or twice Limborch drops into the more conventional mode as when he writes "*poenam peccatis nostris meritam quasi in se transtulit.*" But Ménégoz (who notices that sentence) has given a fair description of a commentary which deserves rather special attention¹. Limborch seriously attempts to realise the individual character of the epistle. And he ends his prolegomena with this insistence on the

¹ *Philippi a Limborch Commentarius in Acta Apostolorum et in Epistolas ad Romanos et ad Hebraeos. Roterodami, 1711.*

distinctive value of Hebrews: "So that we ought to value very highly an epistle without which we would be ignorant of much which pertains to the distinct understanding of the priesthood of Christ." It is always the contrast rather than the likeness between the sacrifice of Christ and the Levitical sacrifices that he draws out, thus avoiding a style of interpretation which even in much later times has hindered the right use of the epistle. And he approaches the idea of the living power of the Blood of Christ which was not to be clearly presented till Westcott wrote.

His preface is significant, in which he lays down with no little force the principles of historical interpretation as the indispensable basis of all study, and in particular of the application of prophecy. The same kind of thing may be found in Calvin and in nearly all writers since Erasmus. In Calvin it is expressed with the beautiful lucidity of a Frenchman who is thoroughly master of a good Latin style. But in practice Calvin too often allows his scholarly principles to be wrested by party feeling. In Limborch we enjoy another atmosphere, not so brilliant but larger, more free. And this is perhaps what is chiefly to be remarked in the Arminian commentators generally. They are remonstrants against a particular form of Augustinian doctrine. They stood for ante-Nicene Greek theology. They were at home in learned churches where the Humanities were cared for. In all these respects they have a natural kinship with the epistle to the Hebrews, and especially in the last. The Alexandrine Platonism of the epistle, its good Greek style, its tender sympathy with the very shadows of the old Law which it shews to be vanishing away; all this is in the broad sense of the term "Arminian."

§ 7. *The real manhood of Christ: already recognised
by Nestorius as characteristic of Hebrews.*

So again is its interest in the whole of our Lord's earthly life, the frankness with which it recognises the limitations of His manhood during "the days of His flesh." And here we must go back to the fifth century, and notice a writer of that period who did remarkably appreciate this characteristic of

Hebrews. He was Nestorius, and some of his teaching was indeed condemned as running out into heresy. But the orthodoxy of the sermon on the Epistle to the Hebrews, of which Dr Bethune Baker¹ gives a summary, will hardly be disputed since, until 1905, it was attributed to S. Chrysostom. Nestorius here interprets Hebrews in accordance with the tradition of the school of Antioch; Antioch "which early in the second century had had as its bishop the Ignatius who had insisted with such passionate earnestness on the reality of the human nature and experiences of Jesus, who had made his appeal above all else to the actual facts of the Gospel history—at Antioch the historical tradition had never been allowed to fade....The theologians of Antioch started from the manhood...laid stress on all the passages in Scripture which seemed to emphasize the human consciousness of the Lord...insisted on the recognition in His Person of a genuine human element in virtue of which a genuine human experience was possible. They did not for a moment call in question, or fail to recognize, the equally genuine Divine element, in virtue of which Divine experience and power was His. They did not doubt that the historical Jesus.Christ was both God and man. They took their stand on history, on the primitive record, on apostolic testimony and interpretation" (Bethune Baker, pp. 3 f.).

§ 8. *Hellenistic philosophical colour: Carpzov's illustrations from Philo.*

Thus did Nestorius in the fifth century re-assert one of the characteristics of this epistle, its insistence on the true manhood of our Lord. And thus, at the revival of learning, did the Arminians attempt to recover its particular doctrine of sacrifice. A third peculiarity, its affinity with the philosophical Judaism of Philo, was brought out in the eighteenth century by J. B. Carpzov, who collected parallels from Philo for almost every verse of the epistle². No one had treated the subject with anything like this elaboration before.

¹ *Nestorius and his teaching.* Cambridge, 1908.

² *Sacrae exercitationes in S. Pauli epistolam ad Hebraeos ex Philone Alexandrino.* Helmstadii, 1750.

Henceforth it was impossible to ignore the Hellenistic idiosyncrasy of author and readers. They might be "Hebrews," but they were not "Hebrews" in the narrower sense of Hebrew-speaking Jews. They belonged at least to the liberal Judaism of S. Stephen, probably to the philosophic Judaism of Apollos.

§ 9. *Interest in special character of Hebrews provokes search for suitable author: Luther's conjecture of Apollos, etc. Tradition only supports Barnabas (besides Paul) and the search is vain.*

That no doubt had already struck Luther when he conjectured Apollos as the author. Possibly Luther, and the moderns who have accepted his conjecture, read more into the few lines in which Apollos is described (Acts xviii. 24 f.) than is really to be found there. The conjecture is not supported by tradition. Harnack's idea that Priscilla was the authoress is a development from Luther's inference. Barnabas is the only name which can be connected with anything like a real tradition, and the Barnabas tradition only emerges for a moment or two and is lost in darkness on either side. The other names proposed, Luke, Clement, Apollos, Silas, Philip the deacon, Aristion—one writer has even suggested S. Peter—are mere conjectures; some of which are surely impossible. That there should be one letter in the New Testament which was not written by any person who happens to be mentioned in the other books, is quite in accordance with the analogies of literary history. It may be added, though not as an argument, that our interest in the apostolic Church and our reverence for its rich inspiration would be increased thereby. The character, education and to a large extent the circumstances of the author may be gathered from the letter itself. The mere precision of a name would not illuminate the background very much.

§ 10. *Destination more important, but precision difficult; not Jerusalem. Rome proposed, and (improbably) Gentile readers.*

It is otherwise with the question of the destination. If we could suppose that the epistle was addressed to the Church at

Jerusalem some time between the outbreak of the war with Rome and the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, our interpretation of the whole argument and of many difficult passages would be confined to something like certainty. But it would be a confining. Other passages would take on new difficulties. Much is said about the tabernacle in Hebrews: there is not a line which implies that either writer or recipients had ever seen the temple. There may well have been Hellenistic Jews at Jerusalem who read Greek and were accustomed to Alexandrine terms of philosophy. But it is not at Jerusalem that we should readily look for these, and it is certain that the epistle would have been quite unsuited to the Church of Jerusalem as a whole. J. J. Wetstein, in the edition of the Greek Testament which he published at Amsterdam, 1751-2, was the first to argue for Rome as the destination. Others, e.g. von Soden¹, have combined this view of the destination with the assertion that there is nothing in the epistle to confirm the accuracy of the ancient title and that there is much to prove it addressed to Gentile Christians. This is, paradoxical though the statement may sound, more agreeable to a superficial reading than to a patient study of the epistle. The Judaic roots are there, but they are not to be discovered in the mere obvious allusions to Jewish ritual.

§ 11. *Modern criticism would supersede these enquiries by regarding Hebrews as a late treatise or sermon. So Moffatt, whose view of doctrinal development may however be modified by recognition of the "apocalyptic" origin of the Gospel: Schweitzer;*

However all such disputes may seem to have been superseded of late. Neither author nor destination matters much. Nor do the Jewish or Gentile antecedents of the readers. The epistle was written at a time when the Pauline controversy about the Law was forgotten. There is no sharply cut background. It is a doctrinal treatise, sermon-like; very interesting as a witness to the comparatively early development of Christian dogma, but scarcely in touch with the

¹ *Hand-Commentar*. Freiburg, 1899.

vigorous life of those primitive communities who had lately been making Christian history.

This has been well put by Dr Moffatt in his *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* and in his earlier book—so useful and delightful—*The historical New Testament*. But there is still something to be said on the other side. This view of Hebrews is part of a general view of the development of apostolic Christianity which needs some readjustment in the light of that “apocalyptic” reading of the primitive gospel, lately revived by Albert Schweitzer¹.

So far as affects the question before us here, the matter may be summed up as follows. The idea of what may be called liberal theologians had long been that from an early Galilean faith in Jesus as the Master, a Pauline, Johannine, and finally “catholic” faith was gradually developed in the eternal and divine Son. In such development Hebrews would come comparatively late. There is nothing unworthy in such a view. Development of the faith is the counterpart to revelation through the Holy Spirit. But the difficulty was to find a link between Galilee and S. Paul. To the apocalyptic view the link is plain. The background of the synoptic gospels is formed by those late Jewish apocalypses of which Daniel and the Enoch literature are the type. Our Lord entered upon His ministry in Galilee when a world of thoughts about the coming Kingdom of God was everywhere astir. These thoughts were vague; spiritual hopes were mingled with political; yet a great exalted spirit breathed everywhere. The kingdom would not be of this world; the Christ-king might be in some sense divine. Our Lord accepted the popular expectations. How far He acquiesced in their outward form; in what way He corrected and purified the idea; how He came to the determination that by His own death the kingdom must be brought in—these are the problems of the critical historian. But criticism tends to this

¹ In his *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, Tübingen, 1906. An English translation with the title *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* was published in 1910, and the best introduction to the subject is Dr Burkitt's little book, *The earliest sources for the life of Jesus*, Constable, 1910.

broad result. The synoptic gospels, especially S. Mark, are good historical documents as they stand; simple souls may rightly account for the whole course of our Lord's action by His implicit faith in the Father's guidance; the disciples believed that He was the destined Christ who would one day come in divine glory with the kingdom; that belief was interrupted by the crucifixion, but was confirmed and deepened by the resurrection; and S. Paul's faith in Christ Jesus, the exalted Son of God, hidden for a while in heaven, His original and eternal home, whence in the great day He would come to gather quick and dead, was simply his ancient Jewish faith completed by his conviction that Jesus was the Christ.

Nor was this profound theology revealed only to S. Paul. It was the faith of the Church he entered after his conversion. He directed it, perhaps restrained it within the lines of reasonable truth. The tremendous spiritual impulse, which was the main source of his inspiration, enabled him to bring what was weak or uncertain to new and deeper expression. But though a high Christology may develop its expression, it will always be a return to primitive faith, and will never involve of necessity long distance from memories of the past. There is development of that kind in Hebrews. The first readers of this epistle evidently had what we call an imperfect conception of the Person of Christ. Their friend appeals to the primitive belief in Christ as truly divine. He uses for his task of persuasion all that has been thought, said or done before his days, by the household at Jerusalem immediately after the crucifixion, by S. Paul, by Hellenists like S. Stephen and Apollos. And now he turns the ancient symbol of the Kingdom into new language for his Alexandrine friends, just as Dr DuBose in his exposition of this epistle, *High Priesthood and Sacrifice*, tries to turn its phraseology "into current coin." And he had two important aids. The crisis of the times—perhaps it really was the storm gathering over Jerusalem—was a sign that then was to be the promised Day; in that shaking the Kingdom and the Christ were coming. And the education of author and readers in philosophy provided a set of terms in which this translation

of the primitive symbol might be shaped with peculiar fitness; for the pressing difficulty lay in "the scandal of the cross," the humiliation which characterised the Christian course, and which could be shewn to run out into eternal glory by the philosophic principle of sacramental significance in the realities of life.

§ 12. *and by the now more generally recognised earliness of "catholic" thought and practice: Baur, Lake, Bousset; Graeco-Roman influence on development.*

Schweitzer's two books—for he presently wrote another in which he shewed S. Paul to be thoroughly imbued with apocalyptic Judaism—have, it seems, influenced English thought far more than German. In Germany the old "liberal" theology held on its way. The details of Baur's criticism have long been discredited. It is right that much of his principle should still be recognised as true. His *Church History*¹ is a stimulating book that should still be read by all who really care to meditate on the origins of creed and church. Very briefly his doctrine is that "the fightings without and fears within" which S. Paul, and doubtless many another of the early leaders, met patiently and faithfully, vanished in a gradual reconciliation of half views. Then, as the fit time came, the more complete idea of Christ's Person, of the Church, the Ministry, the Sacraments, descended, explained all, and took possession. "Descended" is the right word. The process came, as we should say, from God. The suspicion with which Baur is regarded, arises from his refusal to say just that. However, there is no need to speculate here as to what Baur's own opinions were about the Christian dogmas. So far as it goes the doctrine here sketched can only encourage us to more thoughtful reverence. But it begins in these days to be clear that a simpler thread of popular faith was drawn out continuously from the first, and that this popular faith was in essentials far more like the fully-developed faith of the Church's worship than used to be supposed. On this point much instruction may be gained from Professor

¹ *The Church History of the first three Centuries*, Tübingen, 1853, English Translation, Williams and Norgate, 1878.

Kirsopp Lake's book, *The earlier Epistles of St Paul*. And again and again as we pursue the enquiry we find that, while there is much truth in Baur's idea of Hebrews and other epistles belonging to a period of "reconciliation," there is no good reason for reserving that period to a late date.

The most important in what we may venture to call the succession of Baur is Dr Wilhelm Bousset, who argues¹ that it was in worship that development of faith most largely took place. This influence of ritual and of the emotion of common worship was mainly due to the Church's assimilation of Asiatic Greek ideas. In Hebrews an almost extreme example of this ritual spirit is displayed. To reach such a pitch of interest time was needed, and Hebrews is therefore separated by a considerable interval from S. Paul. Again it is evident, even from this passing reference, how much Bousset stimulates thought. Worship is still deepening—not of course without some risk of perverting—faith. This recognition of the influence of worship implies a strong united Church feeling, resting on continuous tradition, as the living soil in which new thoughts and enthusiasms grow into flower. The old crude idea of a Paul or an *auctor ad Hebraeos* starting a fresh line of faith is unnatural. But, with Bousset again, sober reflection on all we know about these early days puts things in a different proportion. There is more anxiety in our author's mind about his friend's loyalty to Christ in some terrible crisis, than interest in ritual. And the reasons for placing the epistle at a late date are far weaker than those for recognising in it a new stage in the expression of ancient truth.

§ 13. *Transformation of this early "catholicism" in Windisch's representation of the ultra-dogmatic character of Hebrews.*

But, distinct from these descendants of Baur, another school of theologians has lately arisen in Germany. They might be called—with perhaps an unfair touch of caricature—the Literalists. Some of them have come to sacred

¹ *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christenthums bis Irenaeus*. Göttingen, 1913.

literature from a previous training in classical languages. They are abundantly, if not broadly, erudite. They care little for the delicacies of language, but press the plain meaning of passages. To this class belongs Dr Windisch, author of a short book¹ full of matter, with freshly-gathered quotations from Philo and from the literature of the Graeco-Roman world. In fact, this handbook by itself supplies pretty well all the material a reader might desire for inference and discussion. The author of the epistle is left unnamed. He was a Hellenistic Jew, with the same Greek background of education as Philo, but less Greek in character, more apocalyptic. He still expects the future manifestation, therein resembling with a difference S. John. The readers were a community, mainly non-Jewish, which might be anywhere except Jerusalem. The date 80 A.D. or rather later. The author had nothing to do with the temple, but mediated Old Testament ritual for Christians. He was nearer S. Paul than any other New Testament writer, yet with many notable divergences. He has something in common with the Synoptists, whom Windisch (like Bousset) considers to represent, not quite the historical Jesus of Nazareth, but the theological belief of the early Christian family concerning Him. Only this writer is more infected with Hellenistic ideas, more influenced by the Septuagint, than the Synoptists were. The main value of his epistolary sermon is in its doctrine of the exalted Christ, and especially in the particular aid which the author's figurative language about His high-priesthood produced (1) for the further expression of the Church's doctrine of redemption, (2) for the Church's adoption of the sacred, and especially the legal, books of the Old Testament.

But Windisch would hardly approve of the word "figurative." Though to us the language is figurative, he would take it as far more literally meant by the author himself. To Windisch Hebrews has hardly any real sense of the days of the Lord's flesh, but centres on "The Heavenly Being, mythically conceived." This literalism appears in an extravagant form in a note to v. 7—the flesh was laid aside in the

¹ *Der Hebräerbrief erklärt von Lic. Dr Hans Windisch, Privatdozent an der Universität Leipzig. Tübingen, 1913.*

ascension; our Lord took with Him only the blood. And again, on x. 28 "the Christian eschatology still knows the pitiless God of the Old Testament and of Judaism." The strong, learned excursus will be dealt with later (III. § 20) in which he almost compels assent to his thesis that "no second repentance" was the primitive, essential dogma, weakened in later days.

Yet Windisch's is a valuable commentary. If only for the illustrative material, so skilfully selected from sources hardly touched by earlier commentators, but recognised to-day as highly important for the elucidation of at least a large part of the New Testament, it will be for years to come all but indispensable. And the terse, business-like expression is admirable. What Bengel's *Gnomon* is for unction, Dr Windisch is in his dry compression. His book has always been on the table at which these pages were written.

§ 14. *Modern English commentators. Their fine scholarship: Rendall. Their broad, practical elucidation of the theology of the epistle: Davidson and Maurice distinguish type from shadow; Bruce discovers the imperfection of the readers' faith, and the author's conception of "glory in humiliation"; that sacramental idea elaborated by DuBose, who also shews how Christ re-enacts His sacrifice in men. Westcott's explanation of the Blood as indicating life enriched through death.*

Of late however more help for the understanding of this epistle has come from England and from America. English theologians have generally been strong in that broad advantage of a classical education which combines "humanity" with grammar. For such a book as Hebrews that is a specially desirable qualification in a commentator. Hence we have a series of editions which are recommended by fine scholarship—C. J. Vaughan, Macmillan 1891; Farrar, the very interesting predecessor of this present book in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges; Wickham in Methuen's Westminster Commentaries 1910, a work of finished beauty; and, philologically perhaps the best of all, F. Rendall, Macmillan 1883.

Dr A. B. Davidson contributed a small edition of Hebrews to Messrs T. and T. Clark's *Handbooks for Bible Classes*, which

like all, even his most unpretending work, is firm, simple and philosophical. His treatment of the theme "Priesthood after the order of Melchizedek" is particularly valuable. He, perhaps for the first time, puts the Aaronic priesthood and the Levitical sacrifices into their true proportionate place, as merely "shadow"; the author is not concerned with the comparative worth of the old ritual, but with the absolute difference in kind of the eternal priesthood which our Lord fulfilled. F. D. Maurice in his Warburton Lectures for 1845-6, had wrestled with this problem, recognising that Israelites had certainly enjoyed a real communion with God; that nevertheless their institutions, so far forth as these were institutions, lacked reality; and that though in Christ who is "a Son" reality has come, there must still be some kind of institutions in the Christian Church if this reality is not to fade away again into a vague cloudland. He solves the problem in the last lecture by distinguishing the "figurative" from the "sacramental." But he does not present his solution quite clearly. As in so much of his published work, the deep significance of these lectures comes home most effectually to those who have also learned to understand him from his letters and conversations. Two sayings of his throw much light on certain seeming inconsistencies in the epistle itself: "To me it is the pleasantest thing possible to have intercourse with men. But for shadows I have no respect at all," and "My paradox about form being more spiritual than spirit," *Life*, II. p. 299, I. p. 311.

In 1891 Dr William Milligan gave in his Baird Lecture¹ an eloquent defence and exposition of the truth, so insisted upon in Hebrews, that the doctrine of the living and exalted Christ is the indispensable complement of faith in His atoning death. A good companion to this book, as a real aid to a hearty appreciation of the epistle, would be the lately published *Letters of Richard Meux Benson* (Mowbray), which are indeed this Epistle of the Ascension translated into modern life. Dr William Milligan's son, Dr George Milligan, published in 1899 *The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with a critical introduction* (T. and T. Clark), a very useful book. Dr Moffatt's

¹ *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord*. Macmillan.

chapter on Hebrews in *The Literature of the New Testament* has been already mentioned. The commentary which he is to contribute to Messrs T. and T. Clark's *International Critical Commentaries* is eagerly expected. Meanwhile the small edition by Professor A. S. Peake in *The Century Bible* holds a distinguished place among recent commentaries. His brief introduction is commendably sober in conjecture as to author, date and destination. Yet he leans towards an early date, and is convinced that "in the argument as a whole we find decisive proof that the readers were Jewish Christians in peril of falling back into Judaism."

In a notable book¹ Dr Bruce brings the point out clearly, that the readers of the epistle had not attained to more than an imperfect apprehension of the faith of the Church, and that this "first apology for Christianity" was designed to set the full and generally accepted faith before them. More important still is his insistence on the teaching of the epistle about our Lord's true manhood with all its limitations, especially in what he says in his fourth chapter about our Lord's glory being in, rather than after, His humiliation; the exaltation was latent in the humiliation. This opens the way to recognition of that sacramental principle which, sketched in Hebrews, was afterwards elaborated in the Fourth Gospel, and which perhaps alone conserves the reality, without confusion, of both the Godhead and the Manhood of the Redeemer.

What is meant by the sacramental principle of the Manhood is even more clearly brought out by Dr William Porcher DuBose in *High Priesthood and Sacrifice; an exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*². This is the third part of the tetralogy in which he interprets the four main varieties of New Testament teaching; the others are *The Gospel in the Gospels*, *The Gospel according to Saint Paul*, and *The Reason of Life* (S. John). Few books prove more conclusively than these that loyalty to the complete catholic faith is no hindrance to frank originality but the most wholesome stimulus.

¹ *The Epistle to the Hebrews, the first apology for Christianity; an exegetical study.* T. and T. Clark, 1899.

² Longmans, 1908.

But the greatest of modern commentaries is Westcott's¹. The Greek text itself is the best that has ever been printed of this epistle separately. The select *apparatus criticus* is easy to use, and the Introduction contains an admirable section on mss. and versions. Then the skilfully chosen quotations from the Fathers are most instructive. Each tells, coming in appropriately. And the continuity of exegetical tradition is thus displayed, a tradition which justifies the belief that the author's meaning is always likely to be deeper than our quick judgement might suppose. Of Westcott's own interpretations this may perhaps be said without impertinence. The longer they are dwelt upon the more right they are apt to prove. What may seem at first too subtle turns out to be sympathetic with the author's habit of thought, and when the reader disagrees with some passage he is likely to find on further meditation that his own idea has been included and transcended in Westcott's more complete perception. The eminent service however which Dr Westcott has rendered to the study of Hebrews is this. He has carried out what (as we saw above) the Arminians attempted, viz. the true explanation of the sacrificial language: sacrifice is offering, not loss; and "blood" in the phraseology of sacrifice means life not death, though in supreme sacrifice it does mean life enriched by death.

III

THE THEOLOGY OF THE EPISTLE

§ 1. *Hebrews was addressed to a little group of Hellenistic-Jewish friends: is a real letter; calling upon them to do a hard duty in a dangerous time, viz. to be loyal to Jesus Christ whom they worship, but as yet imperfectly, and to break with Judaism.*

THE particular form which theology takes in any treatise is determined by the purpose of the writer. That purpose depends upon the occasion of writing. Hence it is necessary

¹ *The Epistle to the Hebrews, the Greek text with notes and essays.* Macmillan, 1st ed. 1889.

to make up our minds, as far as possible, about the date, circumstances and destination of Hebrews, before attempting to study the characteristics of its theology. We have seen how the tendency of the latest criticism is to give up the search for the author's name, and the name of the place to which he sent his epistle. There has also been a reaction against the ancient tradition that the readers had come from Judaism to Christianity. But that reaction has passed into another phase; the question, Were the readers Jewish or Gentile? is no longer considered important, since the epistle belongs to so late a time that this distinction had already become almost obsolete in the Church. For Hebrews is generally considered a late treatise, more like a sermon than a letter. Some trouble of the day had indeed in part called it forth. But that impulse is a secondary matter; the dogmatic interest is the main thing. Yet on the whole Rome is preferred as destination, and it is sometimes thought that the letter was addressed to a household community, a part of the larger church in Rome. Whether in Rome or not may be doubtful. But this idea of the small community is winning acceptance and is probably right. It is hardly likely that a letter so polished, so full of technical philosophic language, and so coloured with actual philosophic thought, should have been written to any mixed assembly, however small. We had better conclude that the author wrote to a group of friends who, like himself, had received an Alexandrine education.

And if so, it must surely have been a Jewish-Alexandrine education. The title "To Hebrews" may have been but an early inference from the contents. That inference may have been drawn from the same misunderstanding as has long prevailed, and of late has prejudiced the enquiry in a contrary direction. For, strictly taken, "Hebrews" means Hebrew-speaking Jews, and that—we can all see now—is just what the readers of this epistle were not. But they may have been Hellenists, may have never seen the temple, and yet the case may be strong for considering them to have been by birth and training Hellenistic Jews. And the case is strong. The argument of the epistle as a whole would have much meaning for Christians who had been Jews, little for others. Much of

its difficulty for us Westerns to-day arises from its taking for granted Jewish principles of sacrifice which Gentiles even then would not be familiar with. And there is a personal note. The Jewish ritual and priesthood are indeed spoken of as a mere shadow; they are not to the author the "types" which Christ "fulfilled." But Jewish "Christship" is such a real type. And even the ritual is given up with a pang; and if the ancient priesthood was but a shadow, the good priests whom author and friends had known were very far from shadowy. Start from ch. v. and see if this be not true; then read through the whole letter and see whether the impression be not confirmed.

For surely it is a letter, not a sermon. Though like 1 John it begins without a salutation, there is no need to suppose that no definite address was prefixed. Indeed, when once the view here proposed is accepted, it becomes tempting to fancy that "To Hebrews" was originally at the head of the roll, a playful subtlety like v. 12, xiii. 22, meaning "To you whom after all I will call Hebrews indeed." And it is a letter called forth by some very urgent occasion. The exhortations and warnings with which it is punctuated have echoes in almost every verse. The writer is throughout urging his friends to face some particular and hard duty, and in his final blessing, xiii. 20, 21, he prays that they may be enabled to make the right choice and do the duty. The ancient text with its antithesis of "you" and "us" makes this clear. The later text, conventionalised for church reading, obscures this; one of several instances which explain the tendency, so often recurring, to allow the remarkable interest of the epistle's intellectual theology to obscure the practical appeal to the will which was the supreme interest of the author.

For his theology is developed as reinforcement to his appeal. Once Jews of the broader Hellenistic party, his friends had become Christians but Christians of a most imperfect kind. They had joined the Christian Church because it offered that "reformation" of Judaism for which they had been looking, but they had not apprehended the deepest significance of this reformation. Jesus of Nazareth was indeed to them the Christ, but they had not understood all

that the Church believed to be involved in that recognition. They had not properly appreciated the mystery of His Person, or of the salvation which had been wrought through His death, or of His "indissoluble life" and His exalted state and continued authority and power to aid. And now some great trial was at hand which would test their allegiance. And in face of this they were in doubt. Was it, they were asking, worth while to hold to this reformed religion when there was very strong reason for returning to the simpler faith of their fathers? See especially v. 11—vi. 8.

The strong reason was above all bound up with honour. Holding fast to Jesus as Christ might very likely bring loss of property, imprisonment, even death; see x. 32—39, xii. 4. But that was not the great difficulty. The "sin" which their friend fears they may commit is a specious one; there is "deceitfulness" about it, something that may confuse the real issue; as yet they have not done the wrong, but it is already an influence working all about them subtle in associations, clinging to them like a garment; one strong effort of will is needed to break free, and if that effort is not made the catastrophe will be irreparable. See iii. 13, vi. 4—6, x. 10, 23, 26—31, xii. 1. But these references are inadequate by themselves. There is hardly a paragraph in the letter but illustrates the situation we are imagining, and it is the letter as a whole, read with this idea in mind, which justifies our imagination. So read, it culminates at last in the appeal of xiii. 13 to go forth to Jesus outside the ancient "camp" of Israel, bearing His shame. The meaning must surely be that the hour has come when the followers of Jesus the true Christ must break with traditional Judaism. The earliest apostolic community had not done so. The apostles had frequented the temple, observing the Jewish hours of prayer (Acts iii. 1), and S. Paul's marked reverence for the mother Church at Jerusalem had been of a piece with his claim that in standing for Jesus the living Christ he was faithful to the hope of the fathers (Acts xxvi. 5—7). But now that old alliance must be interrupted.

§ 2. *The occasion may be the outbreak of the war with Rome:*

To take that bold step, and to take it just at a time when it would be shameful, as it seemed, to take it, was the hard duty to which this letter urges the little band of thoughtful Jewish Christians, its readers. What then was the occasion? Why was this to be done, and what made the doing so particularly difficult? All becomes plain if the letter was written about A.D. 65 or 66 when the zeal of a party had become a national spirit of self-sacrifice, and the enthusiasm of the zealots had involved a whole people in war against Rome. "It was Florus," writes Josephus, "who compelled us to undertake war with Rome, seeing as we did that it would be better to perish as a nation than by partial and repeated persecution. The beginning of the war was in the second year of the procuratorship of Florus, the twelfth of Nero's reign," i.e. A.D. 66 (*Antiq.* xx. 11).

How moving the appeal would be to all Jews, in Palestine especially, but in all places too whence it was possible for Jews to travel to Palestine, and rally round the national standard, and fight for hearth and home, laying aside all party differences and uniting in the ancient hallowed battle-cry, "The LORD our God, the LORD, one!" (cf. Deut. vi. 4; Heb. xiii. 8). And to none would it come with more force than to these "philosophic liberals," who had toyed with speculative hopes of a reformed creed, and were now summoned to play the man, and throw themselves into the stream of life in its intensity and simplicity. They were fairly well to do (vi. 10, x. 34, xiii. 5), and wherever situated, could make the journey to Palestine. They seem to have never been quite at home in the community of Christians they had joined (x. 25, xiii. 17); no doubt early apocalyptic Christianity was a rude environment for these intellectual people. They are inclined to weary themselves no more with niceties of creed; they will return to the simplicity of the faith of their childhood, which is at least enough for men of honour: see v. 11—14.

§ 3. *when the patriotic appeal, so attractive to these imperfect disciples, was contrary to the faith of Christ.*

They were however making a double mistake. The Jewish rising was not the pure patriotism they imagined, and the Christian faith was more than a reformed Judaism.

The Jewish rising was not pure patriotism. These Christian Jews were confronted with the very choice which had been offered to our Lord when He called for the tribute money and gave His decision, "Render unto Caesar." That was no clever shelving of the question; it was a decision which cost Him life. It was a practical summing up of all He taught about the kingdom of God. That kingdom was not to be the political triumph of Judaism, but the universal victory of that true religion which had been especially entrusted to the Jews; "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." The quotation in Heb. x. 30, "Vengeance is mine," may have been suggested by Rom. xii. 19, but it has a more concentrated purpose in Hebrews. When this epistle was written, the problem was set for the first time which has so often been forced upon the Church again, how to apply the peaceful doctrine of the Sermon on the Mount to national politics. The solution was perhaps more simple then than it has been on some later occasions, but it was not absolutely simple. The case for the patriots must have seemed very strong. Looking back now, we can see that the author was right every way. Josephus' history of the war shews the evil passions that tainted the spirit of the heroically fighting Jews. The issue of the struggle might appear but one more of the frequent examples of might triumphing and yet not being right; but the subsequent development of Rabbinism goes near to prove that the fight was not for the truth, but for a narrow sectarian religion. And yet even now we may confuse cause and effect, and then these things were hidden from the passionate actors in the tragedy.

The author of the epistle saw the right way clearly, and he saw the way because he had a real apprehension of the life, work and Person of the Lord. He understood the supreme and final worth of the salvation wrought through

Him, and knew that even the purest claims of patriotism could not outweigh devotion to the new faith; no such conflicting duty could be real duty; to merge the perfect work of Christ in Judaism could not be right, and on no other terms might Jewish patriotism be satisfied. To his friends he could put this in an elementary manner: You have given allegiance to the Lord Jesus as the Christ; no other plea of honour can set you free from that allegiance. That plain preliminary appeal runs through the epistle.

§ 4. *Therefore the author would deepen their faith by using the analogy of priesthood to explain the Person and the work of Christ.*

He also knew that, if he could lift the faith of these friends of his to the level of his own, they would find in the Lord Jesus Christ such strength as would enable them to make the hard choice. Hence his letter consists of an intellectual argument mingling with an emotional appeal. And the argument takes this form: Think of Him as a priest and I can make you understand. If it be asked why he threw his reasoning into that form, no certain answer can be given. No doubt the letter, like most letters, is the continuation of earlier conversations; the subject had been discussed before and this illustration had been used. Philo had used it in his theologising about the Word of God. It may be that Philo himself had not been read by these people. But, if not Philo, the masters of Philo had been theirs, and the divine High Priest was a conception that might very naturally have arisen from their Alexandrine education. But it may be there is no need to search so curiously. Christ the High Priest is an idea so frequent in the earliest Christian literature that it can hardly have been derived from this long disputed epistle. The germs of the idea are already to be found in two books of the New Testament which in other respects have affinities with Hebrews, viz. 1 Peter and the Apocalypse, but which again can hardly have drawn upon Hebrews. The instinct, inference, or possibly tradition of the Church may well be right, not in making the Levitical Law the main interest of the epistle, but at least in recognising in that Law a natural analogy for

the instruction of Christians who had been brought up under it. That the analogy is not evidently used in any other book of the New Testament, and that the two books, just mentioned, which do approach such use are specially connected with Jewish Christianity (cf. 1 Pet. i. 1), shews that it is not quite reasonable to say that all Christians, Jewish and Gentile alike, knew the Old Testament well, and might as easily have welcomed the same analogy.

§ 5. *He does this on the lines of atonement, mediation, approach to God. The Jewish ritual affords a starting point for the discovery of a truer type.*

But this need not be laboured. Let us pass on to consider how the analogy of priesthood is applied. The whole work of priesthood may be summed up in four phrases from the epistle: "to make propitiation" or atonement; "taken from among men"; "in things pertaining to God" or (as the Greek might be rendered) "on the Godward side"; and "the way." The priest "makes atonement" for sins. He does this because he is a mediator, a man "taken from among men," yet standing "on the Godward side" of men. Thus he opens a "way" by which men cleansed from sin may enter the presence of God. See ii. 17 f., v. 1 f., x. 19—22. This is all part of a series of pictorial terms derived from the Levitical ritual, which forms the starting point for the analogy. But, before we go further, it is necessary to state plainly that nothing more than this is derived from the Levitical ritual. After all the Levitical priest actually effected none of these things. Nor could they ever be effected by the institutional means he used however far developed. If the work of Christ is conceived as a development or fulfilling of something thus begun, the argument of the epistle becomes unsatisfactory. It could never convince any one who had not already accepted the reality of the salvation brought by Him; and even to such believers it would only be an illustration, helping them to formulate their belief in a special manner. But the epistle reiterates the author's repudiation of that purpose. He says these ancient rites were merely "shadow" and the contrast drawn between the "shadow" and "the actual type or

symbol," x. 1, shews that in choosing the term "shadow" he did not mean to lay stress on its close connexion with the "reality" that cast its shadow before itself, but on the quite unsubstantial fleeting nature of these mechanical (xii. 27), temporary phases of ritual. The Levitical Law, like the Philonic philosophy, gave the author a vocabulary, and started him with an analogy. But he soon passes from analogy to a much more serious kind of reasoning. When he uses an image from the old ritual he never elaborates it fully, nor cares to get the correspondence exact. Forgetting this, we soon meet with difficulties; first with slight ones, as when the author is thought to be detected in some antiquarian inaccuracy; then with great ones, when we force our Lord's spiritual state into a material mould, and dispute as to when His priesthood began, or the precise relation of His intercession to His sacrifice, or enquire what the altar (xiii. 10) or the sanctuary stands for.

§ 6. *But first he shews our Lord to be heir of
Christship and Sonship:*

The epistle opens with a poet's vision of all which is afterwards to be discovered to the readers. The author stands as it were by the throne of God, and sees the light streaming from His invisible glory; impressing itself as with a seal on certain eminences in Israel's history; then taking definite human form in One who inherits the name of Christ and Son from those Christ-kings; then this divine Person makes purification of sins, and returns with His achieved inheritance to the exalted throne from which He proceeded, and which He now shares as King and Priest. The readers will have little doubt from the first who is meant. In ii. 3 a passing reference to "the Lord" would remove any doubt they might have felt. The rest of chapter ii. gives another view of the work of salvation, this time from earth, as it was wrought by Jesus in His humiliation; and in iii. 1—6 the two lines are brought together, and Jesus is declared to be the Christ who as Christ is Son of God, and as the fulfiller of all the imperfect Christship of the past, is Son of God in the supreme sense.

So far, more has been said about our Lord's Christship than His priesthood, and this idea is never dropped throughout the epistle. But already the priesthood has been implied in "when he had made purification," i. 3, and expressly mentioned in ii. 17. Herein we perceive the novelty and the conservatism of the writer's design. He would interpret the old tradition, of "Jesus is the Christ," in new terms, "Jesus is our High Priest." The tradition was quite primitive. It was first expressed as the Christian creed by S. Peter when he said, in the region of Caesarea, "Thou art the Christ." It was re-affirmed, after the shock of the crucifixion, by S. Paul with the development which that trial to the faith rendered necessary. Thus in Rom. i. 2 ff. he wrote: "The gospel of God, which he promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures, concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared"—or "defined"—"to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead."

§ 7. *yet inheriting through the humiliation of real manhood.*

This great confession, or profession as our author would call it, is fully adopted by him. But he retouches it, deepening some lines, the witness of the Old Testament, and (as S. Paul himself did in Colossians) the pre-existence of the divine Son; and modifying one line, since he thinks of the Lord's "raising" rather as "ascension" than "resurrection." But in particular he develops the "born of the seed of David according to the flesh." That is an assertion of the hereditary honour of our Lord's manhood. It is asserted in Hebrews also, once in plain terms, vii. 14, and throughout the epistle wherever the Christship is treated of. But for the most part our author lays the stress on another aspect of our Lord's manhood, that which S. Paul spoke about to the Philippians, ii. 5—11, His humiliation. We can see the reason for this.

The readers of the epistle, with their imperfect apprehension of the Lord's Godhead, were especially interested in His earthly ministry, "the days of his flesh," v. 7. If S. Paul's epistles were the first fruits of the Church's literature, the

synoptic gospels followed them, and we may infer that at about the time when Hebrews was written the thoughts of the brethren were being widely turned to the memories of Jesus of Nazareth. With us too a like revival of interest in the gospel story has taken place, and we know what one of the results has been; the limitations of the Lord's manhood have for a while almost daunted faith. This is a recurring illustration of what S. Paul says the Jews especially felt in his day, "the scandal of the cross," 1 Cor. i. 23. And it is evident that the friends of this author felt it painfully.

And herein is one of the causes of his choosing the analogy of priesthood. In his first mention of the priesthood he insists on real manhood being an indispensable qualification: "Wherefore it behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted," ii. 17 f. He goes on to meet the difficulty full and square. He insists with all his power that our Lord is really "a man"—not merely the representative of men. When speaking of His earthly ministry, he reiterates the human name "Jesus." In speaking of His exalted state, he adds "Christ," or in some other way marks the difference. But he allows no infringement even thus on the very manhood. Even on earth the Lord was Christ, v. 5 ff., and in (or beyond) the heavens He is still "Jesus," iv. 14, xii. 23; "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, yea, and for ever!" is his cry, xiii. 8. And he insists on the limitations of His manhood in uncompromising language. "Though he was a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered"; He was "made perfect" only at the last, and only after He was made perfect did He "become the author of eternal salvation," v. 8 f. He was indeed "without sin," but as His making perfect was quite parallel to the making perfect of other "just men," xii. 23, so His liability to sin was in all reality like theirs; "For we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin,"

iv. 15. And in vii. 27 the natural meaning is that our Lord did once for all and effectually just that which the Levitical priests did often and ineffectually, i.e. offered sacrifice "first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people." This would indeed be what S. Paul also meant in 2 Cor. v. 21, "Him who knew no sin God made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him." But the phrasing in Hebrews is very bold; if it is rather careless than studied, such carelessness is none the less significant.

In no way will the author suffer the real manhood, and therefore the real humiliation, of the Lord to be explained away. From chapter ii. it might appear that the Arian tendency had already shewn itself. Some were inclined to look upon our Lord as neither quite God nor quite man, but an angelic Being. He rejects that by shewing that such Beings are on an entirely different line. According to a quotation he makes from Ps. civ. (Heb. i. 7) the angels are not persons in the sense that God and man are persons. They are what we should call "elemental forces." This was an idea which found favour in later Judaism, and has been adopted by Origen and by later theologians of undoubted orthodoxy. Something like it appears in the Apocalypse, and it is evident from Heb. xii. 22 that it is not irreverent. The irreverence lies in a mean estimate of nature. Seen from the throne of God the lightning and the wind would be, as the Old Testament habitually describes them, angels.

But the epistle merely glances at all that speculation. The author is only concerned with the truth pertinent to his purpose, that the problem of our Lord's Person cannot be solved, or shelved, by fancying Him a mingled creature, neither God nor man. He is both; and only in frank recognition of His manhood will His Godhead be apprehended. Accordingly at ii. 5, after a final dismissal of the angelic theory, the argument proceeds to a vivid picture of the man Jesus fulfilling the destiny of manhood, as it was described in the eighth psalm. The general sense of that psalm is that man for all his feebleness has been exalted by God to high dominion, and the author of Hebrews says that though as

yet this exaltation has not been seen in the case of other men, we do see Jesus thus glorified. But he chooses for the picture of this "crowning with honour and glory" so unexpected a moment that many commentators prefer to do violence to his Greek rather than admit what nevertheless he plainly states, viz. that the supreme moment of humiliation before the Lord died was the supreme moment of His glory on earth. If as is possible he had the passage in Philippians, ii. 5—11, in mind, he has deliberately substituted "glory in humiliation" for S. Paul's "glory after humiliation." In like manner the "joy set before him," xii. 2, is parallel to "the contest set before us" in the preceding verse, and means the joy that the Lord experienced in His endurance of shameful death. Glory in humiliation, Godhead discovered in manhood, death on the cross the entry as High Priest into the very presence of God with eternal salvation found for men; this is the series of inward and outward, eternal and visible, perfection through limitation, that runs through the epistle: see especially x. 19 f., where the flesh of the Lord Jesus is the way He inaugurated into the sanctuary, and xiii. 12, where the crucifixion which to outward appearance was like the off-scouring of a sacrifice—the execution as it seemed of a criminal—was the priestly entrance of the Saviour of men into the presence of the Father.

§ 8. *In this reality of the Lord's manhood the sacramental principle appears which governs the whole epistle. The wide meaning of Sacrament in early theology; a sign partaking of the reality symbolised. So in Christ true Godhead is involved in true manhood; a doctrine opportune for these Alexandrine readers.*

This is the sacramental principle. The word Sacrament has been used in a very sacred but somewhat narrowed sense of late. In the early Church it was applied to all visible symbols of the eternal which were not mere signs, but partook of the reality which they symbolised. If it be objected that this is a perverse usage of the word in modern times, appeal may be made to the fine essay on "Sacraments" in *Lux Mundi* by Francis Paget, late Bishop of Oxford, who shews how the

two ritual sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion, ordained by our Lord, were fitted for His purpose because they were not to be arbitrary observances, but a particular application of that unity and interfusion of the visible and the eternal with which God has ennobled the whole of His creation. The author of this epistle would agree with that. There can be little doubt that in his day the two sacraments were closely bound up with the whole church life. In vi. 4, x. 32, and not improbably in x. 22, he refers to Baptism, and it may be that the epistle is coloured throughout by the phraseology and thought of the eucharistic service. Yet he gives no direct teaching on these rites, whereas the larger sacramental idea pervades his letter. Thus he accepts and transfigures the scandal of the cross. Thus he restates the mystery of Christ's Person, shewing how the limitations of His environment, and—a favourite phrase—His "suffering" were the most fitting means for the interpenetration of His Godhead into earthly life. And thus, as we shall see, the doctrine of His High-priesthood becomes, in the really close reasoning of the epistle, far more than an analogy; it is an application of the sacramental principle of the unity of all life.

But before we consider that three remarks must be made.

First, sacraments are not fancies which merely stimulate thought, as when we say, "This clear sky makes me think of heaven." They are moral realities, as when an officer's courage evokes a like courage in his men; for there the appeal is from a visible act to the eternal divine quality of self-sacrifice which has been implanted in manhood. And it is more than an appeal; it is the setting free of an invisible spiritual power—we call it by an appropriate metaphor, "influence"—which overleaps the boundaries of matter, and joins the very souls of men in one; and moreover lifts them into a higher sphere of energy where physical death is made of no account. So in his doctrine of Christ's Person and saving work, our author concentrates attention on His perfect goodness—His earthly life was a manifestation in this quality above all of eternal life; and on His offering being of His own blood, His very self, consciously and willingly

offered, while in chapter x. (the heart of the epistle) he all but lays aside the sacrificial figures and founds the whole in "will."

Secondly, this may be thought to prove too much. For if all this be true, where is the difference between our Lord and other men? The whole creation is sacramental; all men's lives may be effective symbols of the eternal; how then is He unique? It may be answered that "unique" is not a happily chosen term to describe our Lord's position. Not only in this epistle, but throughout the New Testament, the divine supremacy of Christ is represented as uniting Him with men and so carrying men with Him into God. In the end, says S. Paul, God shall be all in all, 1 Cor. xv. 28. In 2 Pet. i. 4 the promise is that men may become partakers of the divine nature. "As he is so are we also in this world," says S. John, and, "We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him even as he is," 1 John iv. 17, iii. 2, and read especially Joh. xvii. 18—26. And in Heb. i. 2 the whole significance of the phrase would be spoilt if the article were added to "Son": all men are sons of God, not Christ alone.

And yet that "one who is a Son" does not put Him on a level with other sons. In Him, and in Him alone, the divine Sonship was always apparent. There is a Christian ideal which we keep in view but never consistently attain. Because His disciples perceived that He did always live at the level of that ideal, they recognised in Him the light and source of all life that is life indeed. Hence the primitive confession of His Christhood, and the later definition of His Godhead. And yet again that later definition was the discovery, or recovery, of some still deeper truth which again and again has proved itself a necessary truth for those who recognise the wonder and mystery of life—of all mortal life running up into eternities. There are these mysteries about and within us, and, as churchmen think, nothing can give them sense and consistency except the centering them in that supreme mystery of Christ's Person, which is expressed in the sublime language of the Creed, "Light of light, very God of very God ...who for us men and for our salvation came down from

heaven"—all this manifested to us in One who lived as a man among men on earth. This does not separate Him from us. It brings Him closer than ever, for though there is something here which passes our understanding, it is nevertheless the indispensable presupposition to all our understanding of ourselves and our surroundings. And accordingly the author of Hebrews begins his epistle by setting forth this truth more expressly than any writer had done before. He sets it forth; then leaves it. The rest of the epistle treats of the Lord Jesus in the days of His flesh, and of the exalted state which followed. The mode of treatment makes it seem at times that Jesus wins through suffering to Godhead. But that is the view as seen from earth; that is the sacramental figure. The actual truth of this "perfection" is more recon-dite, more universally of moment. And the declaration of the Church's tradition in the introductory verses guards and gives reason to the whole complexity of the freely handled idea.

And thirdly, this sacramental principle was one which the readers could readily accept. For it is a principle which the Alexandrine philosophy had learned from Plato. S. Paul, always quick to take up words and thoughts which he could put to effective use in his teaching, every now and then adopts the sacramental phraseology, but it was not congenial to him. Philologically considered, "sacramental" and "mystical" are the same word, and in our English Prayer Book "mystical" does mean just "sacramental." But "mystical" has of late taken a more particular signification which is almost antithetical to that of "sacramental," implying the inward union of the mind with eternity, a union not mediated by outward things. And in that sense S. Paul is mystical by nature, not sacramental. It is a remarkable coincidence—but see John xiv. 26, xvi. 13—that this Alexandrine thinker, with his vivid style of picture-language, should be writing to Alexandrine Platonists, who needed instruction concerning the Person of Christ, at a time when the interest in our Lord's earthly life was being newly roused. The coincidence produced this first sketch of the application of the sacramental principle to the elucidation of the gospel

story. Later, the evangelist of the fourth Gospel would use the same principle with childlike simplicity and still more profound thoughtfulness in that narrative of the life of Jesus Christ which displays, more splendidly yet quietly than any other writing, Godhead interpenetrating manhood in His Person, and from Him as from a source transfiguring the life of men everywhere.

§ 9. *Christ the High Priest is mediator "on the Godward side," consummating the eternal priesthood which runs through nature and history.*

Now we come to the main thought of the epistle, the High-priesthood of Christ. The idea itself, and the language in which it is elaborated, is derived from the high-priesthood of Aaron as described in the books of the Law. The Book, not the contemporary usage at Jerusalem, is the source; the Tabernacle, not the Temple, is the illustration. And the ritual of the Day of Atonement is especially employed. That was a service in which the high priest took the great part, not the other priests. When the epistle was written the distinction in Greek between "priest" and "high priest" was not carefully observed, and we must not too hastily read subtle significances into the author's application of this title to our Lord; His "priesthood" in the wide sense is the great point, and in Ps. cx., from which the phrase "priest after the order of Melchizedek" is taken, the word is simply "priest." Nevertheless the author's habit is to make the most of what is peculiar and striking in words, and it is reasonable to suppose that when he styled our Lord "High Priest," he did mean to emphasise His eminence in a priesthood which all men shared. It is a title which expresses, symbolically, what we have just now been considering, viz. that our Lord, though He lived on earth as a man among other men, was the first to attain "perfection" of manhood, and so became the representative of all men in the presence of God.

For that, according to the epistle, is the essence of priesthood. It is "on the Godward side," ii. 17, v. 1. In Ex. iv. 16 the Lord promises Moses that Aaron shall be his spokesman; and in the LXX the same Greek phrase is used as here, "and

thou shalt be to him on the Godward side." That is the excellent translation which has been proposed for these words in Hebrews. "On the Godward side": George Herbert wrote "Man is the world's High priest," and again

To this life things of sense
Make their pretence:
In the other Angels have a right by birth:
Man ties them both alone,
And makes them one,

With the one hand touching heaven, with the other earth.

The whole of that poem, "Man's medley," might be quoted in illustration of some of the deepest thoughts of this epistle. This verse has obvious affinities with chapter ii. The idea recurs in other applications. Thus the Messianic quotations in chapter i. point to the Christ-kings of Israel standing on the Godward side of the nation, and the nation on the Godward side of the world. The heirship of the Son to all that has been created through Him, i. 2, and the phrase "for whom are all things, and through whom are all things," ii. 10, indicate that growth of nature up to God which we term evolution, and in the quotation from Ps. cii., in i. 10—12, there is a hint of the same Godward-drawing vitality in changing and perishing things which persists throughout their mutability. So again in xi. 3 the idea is of the successive ages of history being linked together by an influence, not material, which ever works on the Godward side, and in spite of much appearance to the contrary, still leads mankind upward and onward in steady course. The heroes of faith, who are celebrated one after the other in the rest of that chapter, stand in just this Godward relation to their several generations. The divine movement of history goes on, till at last (verses 39 f.) the priestly, Godward-drawing responsibility is found to rest upon the readers of the epistle, whose duty done or failed in will affect the perfecting of all their predecessors. We can of course see the same thing going on still, a father standing on the Godward side of his family, one who sacrifices life for a cause standing on the Godward side of his contemporaries, a parish priest standing on the Godward side of his parish, and so indeed each person who does his

duty in that state to which it pleases God to call him. We might term all this "natural priesthood." The writer of Hebrews would prefer "eternal priesthood," for it is in work like this that "the other world" (ii. 5) breaks in; in this the sacramental quality of life is perceptible.

§ 10. *The author names the eternal and really typical priesthood after Melchizedek, as the artificial shadowy priesthood had been named after Aaron.*

He does however distinguish this priesthood by another term, which no doubt seemed appropriate enough to his Alexandrine friends, but which obscures his meaning to us. He calls it priesthood "after the order of Melchizedek." We see from Philo how the Jewish philosophers of Alexandria had used the mysterious story of Melchizedek to illustrate their doctrine of the Word of God, a doctrine which is often near akin to the idea sketched in the last paragraph. We who have not been brought up in the Alexandrine schools have to make an effort in taking their point of view. And our author has not made that effort easier by his too scholastic treatment of the subject in chapter vii. This is the most Philonic in form of all his writing. And yet the dry, half logical, half fanciful, argument is punctuated by a few great phrases which outweigh much tediousness, and upon which if we fix our attention, we shall not miss his real meaning. What he says is in effect this. The Levitical priesthood is but a ritual institution. All such wear out and pass away. There is no seed in them which grows to perfection. And to-day we see this institution proving weak and unprofitable (vii. 18). Is it to make way for another ordinance of like kind?

No, a better hope (vii. 19) has arisen. In the life and death and victory over death, in the self-sacrifice of Jesus Christ, we hope that the Godward-drawing influence which the Levitical institution represented by ecclesiastical symbolism ("after the law of a carnal commandment"), but which has always been a real working power in the whole world, has reached its destined perfection. This influence has been due to a divine life, always in the world, indissoluble amid all changes and chances; and in Jesus Christ, who died for men

and yet lives, we believe that we recognise the source and the complete manifestation of that life ("after the power of an indissoluble life," vii. 16). He has fulfilled the typical priesthood, and His priesthood, by which we really come to God (vii. 19), shall never pass away as institutional ordinances do (vii. 24). "He is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them," vii. 25.

The institutional priesthood, which merely stimulated thought and emotion (cf. x. 3), is named after a person in the sacred record of Israel's history. The high priest of this artificial order is Aaron. The High Priest of the other, real and living order is Jesus Christ. But cannot a name be found in the same sacred story which may stand as a type of Him, representing all the imperfect efforts of true priesthood which He inspired and has now carried out to their inherent perfection ("made like unto the Son of God," vii. 3)? Will not "Melchizedek" serve this purpose? That personage in the dawn of history appears exercising a priest-king's function, outside the limits of the chosen people, dominating our great ancestor Abraham, and described in mysterious language which suggests eternity of life, vii. 2 f. Here surely is the world-wide, unending priesthood we are seeking. The choice of this name might seem unimportant, but it gains importance when we find a psalmist taking up the name and the idea long afterwards in a psalm which not only testifies to the inextinguishable aspiration of God's people towards the consummation of this effectual priesthood, but also pictures so remarkably the glory of our ascended Lord. "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek," he says; and "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool," vii. 15, 21, viii. 1, cf. i. 13, v. 6, xii. 2.

§ 11. *But another element in true priesthood is atonement, which in Hebrews is oftener represented as cleansing.*

In some such terms as these our author might translate his Alexandrine reasoning were he confronted with his modern readers. But he would have to confess that his phrase "after the order of Melchizedek" does not cover all he has to say

about the priesthood that was consummated by Jesus Christ. There is nothing about "propitiation," "atonement," in the story of Melchizedek. How did our High Priest win that forgiveness of sins which was needed by sinful men if they were really to enter the holy presence of God? This question is answered in the three following chapters, viii.—x. In these we have the exposition of that other key-word, "to make propitiation," ii. 17.

That verb is found elsewhere in the New Testament only once, and there in the sincere, but as yet imperfect prayer of a beginner in the faith, Luke xviii. 13. The reason for this infrequency is not hard to guess. In pagan religion, and in popular misunderstandings of Judaism and Christianity before and since, men have conceived of "propitiation" as the changing of God's mind from hostility to favour. No such idea is admitted in the New Testament. Man is reconciled to God, Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18 ff.; only in a sense which requires explanation can we say in the language of the second "Article of Religion" that Christ died "to reconcile His Father to us"¹; even of the Old Testament the consistent teaching is, "I have loved thee with an everlasting love," Jer. xxxi. 3, "I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely," Hos. xiv. 4. The "wrath" of God, in either Testament, is not contrary to His love, it is His love itself burning its way against opposition. The same feeling about propitiation appears in S. Paul in the one place where he uses a kindred Greek noun, Rom. iii. 25. He guards the true idea by adding "through faith." Another kindred word is twice used by S. John, 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10, and not elsewhere in the New Testament. And this is noticeable. For it is one of the connecting links between Hebrews and the Johannine writings, which stand in the same line as Ezekiel and the priestly writings of the Old Testament. In all these books healing is provided for those who feel the stain rather than the chain of sin. So Ezekiel, for all his insistence upon sacrifices, shews what he recognised as the permanent underlying significance of sacrifices, in such a passage as

¹ See note on "The idea of Reconciliation or Atonement" in Sanday and Headlam's *Romans*, pp. 129 f.

xxxvi. 25 f.: "And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh." Compare with that Heb. ix. 13 f., "For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled, sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" And here we meet with that other word, "cleanse," which the author prefers to "make propitiation." His habit is to translate "propitiation" in terms of "cleansing."

§ 12. *This cleansing is through the Blood, which is life given by God to re-create life. Leviticus: the suffering Servant of the Lord.*

Both terms however are priestly. And this is especially evident when we observe how the cleansing is effected. It is by "blood." Here is a form of speech which would seem very strange to us if we were not so accustomed to read of the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in the New Testament that we have somewhat blunted our apprehension of the startling figure—we are become dull of hearing (Heb. v. 11). Indeed we hardly recognise anything of the nature of figure here. Our Lord's death involved bloodshed; that violent bloodshedding was the price of our salvation. But that idea, though glanced at elsewhere in the New Testament, never enters this epistle. The Greek word for bloodshedding in Hebrews, ix. 22, includes the blood-sprinkling of a sacrifice, and to understand—what to a Christian educated in Judaism would have been as familiar as the doctrine of sacraments is to those brought up on the Church Catechism—we must turn to Lev. xvii. 10 f.:

And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among them, that eateth any manner of blood; I will set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make

atonement for your lives: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life.

In the Hebrews, as R.V. margin shews, one and the same word stands throughout for "soul" or "life." The sense is obscured by varying the translation. The main point is that life atones for life. Indeed we might say "life cleanses life." For the Hebrew ritual term, although in other connexions it means "cover," is very likely akin in this connexion to a similar word in Babylonian ritual which does mean "cleanse¹. And in any case the essential idea is deeper than any ritual metaphor. It is that in sacrifice a life offered to God renews man's spoiled and broken life, re-unites it with the life of God, carries it to its destined perfection in God.

This is true even of the Levitical theology. For the theology of this passage is a conscious, an inspired transformation of an older crude religion. The older base is a mere taboo against eating blood. That taboo is taken into the Mosaic law to stay there for a while till it passes away with the rest of the "shadow." But it is also developed into a truth about God which is to last as long as time. "Atonement" is God's grace; cf. ii. 9: He himself, so far from having to "be propitiated," provides means for reconciling His alienated children to himself. And He finds these means in the mystery of life, and through life brings new life to the dead. Life is appointed by Him to re-create life. Contrast this "life-blood,..given upon the altar" for renewal of life with what Aeschylus says of life-blood spilt upon the ground: "when a man dies and the dust drinks up his blood there is no resurrection," *Eum.* 647 f.; cf. 1 Sam. xiv. 33 f.; 2 Sam. xiv. 14.

How far, even in the Levitical conception, is this mere figure? So far as it was expressed by the use of the blood of victims it was of course mere figure. The life of bulls and goats could never be anything but external to the offerer. Unless atonement or salvation could be wrought for men entirely by an act outside themselves, these sacrifices were merely fictions. And such they were; the Levitical ritual was

¹ See *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, art. "Ritual," § 8.

a shadow. But whenever the principle was transferred from the ritual sacrifices to deeds in which men willingly offered themselves to God's will—to be used by Him in life or death just as He called them to be used—then it did become possible for one man's life to re-create the life of others. And even in Old Testament history we find this happening. Very imperfectly some of the kings of Judah did this. More perfectly the great prophets did it, especially Jeremiah. Above all that person, celebrated in Is. liii. as the Servant of the Lord, by whose suffering and death the peoples were converted and saved, did this. He may have been a historical personage, or he may have been a lyric type, the expression of an inspired prophetic poet's imagination. At any rate his "indissoluble life" was a supreme illustration of the Levitical theology "life re-creating life," and from apostolic times onward he stands as the forerunner of our Lord, the real "type" which could be really fulfilled in Him. We in the twentieth century can hardly avoid the presumptuous fancy that the epistle to the Hebrews would be easier for us to understand if the author had called our Lord's High-priesthood "priesthood after the order of the suffering Servant" instead of "after the order of Melchizedek."

§ 13. *The Blood of Christ is His life enriched by death, through which He appeared before God on our behalf.*

For as we read on and enter upon the profounder chapters viii.—x., it becomes clear that our Lord's "priesthood" reaches its essence in His "sacrifice," and His sacrifice is through His death. It is not His death, simply. The sacrifice is what He offered, and that was His life. But He could only offer it by dying. Yet again it was not through death, simply. The series of words concerning "suffering" are as frequent as those which concern death. The phrase in the Litany, "By thy cross and passion," is in strict accord with the theology of Hebrews. A sacrifice, an offering, is, from the very nature of such words, made at one definite time, once for all. But this is a matter that overpasses the lexicographical precision of single words. This most real offering was a moral action, a personal action with influence from persons to persons,

Christ, God, men. And therefore it was bound up with the development of character—"Christ learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became etc.," v. 8. There was a moment when the sacrifice was offered, and there was a moment when Christ was hailed as High Priest, v. 10. But to press this very far is to make our interpretation servile to the figurative letter. The "becoming," first of Christ then of "those that obey" Him, is as important in the argument of the epistle as is that other point—which nevertheless is exceedingly important—that in Christ's action, as in man's, and especially as it was in that of the first readers, there came one supreme moment, up to which all the past led, and upon which all the future turned.

And that was the moment of His death. If, instructed by the Levitical theology, we were to substitute "life" for "blood" in all those passages of the epistle where the blood of Christ is named, much vivid truth would be recovered for ears blunted by convention. But something too would be lost. In Levitical ritual the death of the victim was not the sacrifice, but the indispensable preliminary; for except by the victim's death, its blood (which was its life) could not be set free for sacrificial "pouring" or "sprinkling." And, taught here by the ritual as before by the Levitical theology, we amend our substitution, and by the "blood of Christ" understand His "life set free and enriched by death." We should probably come near the practical sense of the epistle if we said this life enriched by death was what Christ offered. But the epistle does not quite say that. Following the analogy of the Levitical ritual, the author speaks of His entering the true sanctuary "through his own blood," ix. 12, and sanctifying the people "through his own blood," xiii. 12, and of God bringing Him from the dead "in the blood of the eternal covenant," xiii. 20, and of our entering the true sanctuary "in the blood of Jesus," x. 19. As Aaron entered the sanctuary "with blood not his own," ix. 25, the sacrificial blood being but the instrument by which, or the sphere in which, the offering—itself a mystery not defined—was made, so also Christ. But His offering is defined. The simplest word possible is employed. He offered "himself," ix. 14. Com-

parison with x. 34, xii. 3, shews how high a value the author set on this colourless word. It is as though he checked his picturesque style when he tried to touch the very heart of things. So in the same clause, ix. 14, he abandons even the sacred imagery of the blood, and substitutes the sublime phrase "through eternal Spirit," which might be feebly paraphrased "through the spiritual virtue of the divine holiness of life." And in ix. 24 Christ enters the true sanctuary simply to "appear before the presence of God on our behalf": even the offering of "himself" is left unmentioned: in profoundest, naked truth there is no gift of any kind which God requires.

§ 14. *The significance of death for Christ and for all men: it is the perfecting of life.*

But all this is but an example of the translation of symbolic into "real" language which, from the very constitution of all language, it is impossible to carry out successfully; yet which must be attempted by those who would grapple closely with the mind of this most symbolising writer, and which from time to time he essays himself. Omitting further details of this kind, let us pass on to consider why he should assign so effective a value to the suffering of death. Alexander Ewing, Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, wrote to Erskine of Linlathen, "The outward sufferings of Christ were, so to speak, the accidents of His mission....But I do not know that the *dying* of Christ affects me more than the fact does, that 'He' was acquainted with grief; for in this fact, Christ being what He is, we have expressed to us the Divine sympathy with our sorrows in a way which leaves nothing to be wished for¹." There is much harmony with the epistle in this, but not complete harmony. The author would hardly agree that the sufferings were but accidents of Christ's mission; he would say that we have to deal with sin as well as with sorrow; and he would insist that Christ's actual death was all important. And in that insistence he would be in agreement with S. Paul and S. Peter and with our Lord himself; for though it is by no means plain that our Lord started upon His ministry with

¹ *Memoir*, p. 371. Isbister, 1887.

a plan of salvation which included sufferings and death—in that sense these might be described as “accidents of His mission”—it is plain that when S. Peter confessed Him to be the Christ, He did receive or had received, by what we may perhaps call the inspiration of His incarnation, assurance of the Father’s will that by His death He should bring the promised kingdom of Heaven. Is there here some mystery, hidden in that complete and universal nature of things which none but God can gather into view? It may be that such confession of our limits is the necessary prelude to all discussion of this matter. “We drop our plummet into the depth, but the line attached to it is too short, and it does not touch the bottom. The awful processes of the Divine Mind we cannot fathom¹.” Yet we can go some way towards gaining light from the nature of things even as we behold them. In what follows here Dr DuBose’s chapter on “Human Destiny through Death” in his *High Priesthood and Sacrifice* has given much help.

Death may be considered as an evil, but also as a good. S. Paul generally speaks of physical death as an evil of the same kind as disease seems to be considered in the Gospels. In 1 Cor. xv. 24—27 he says death is “the last enemy that shall be abolished.” But in Heb. ii. 14 f., a passage which looks as though it were in a manner based upon the passage in Corinthians, it is not death but “the fear of death,” and the “bondage” due to that fear, which is represented as the evil. If it be objected that the devil is here said to be the lord of death, answer may be made in a fine sentence from DuBose, which lovers of the Old Testament will be quick to understand; “The devil himself is the supreme evil only as he overcomes us; overcome by us, he is the supreme means of grace.” What the author of Hebrews here lays stress upon is our Lord’s use of death as the means of His victory. And that fits well with the heroic view in ii. 9 of Jesus crowned with glory and honour for the suffering of death. The general idea of death in this epistle is not as an evil disease of mortal men, but as the great means of fulfilling their destiny.

¹ Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 94, Note on “The Death of Christ considered as a Sacrifice.”

And that is what our Lord thought. "Whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it," Mark viii. 35 and parallels. No doubt He meant to include in this losing of life that "death to sin," or to the old self, of which S. Paul so often speaks. But when we remember what He said about the travail pangs of the Kingdom, Mat. xxiv. 8; Mark xiii. 8, it is certain that He was also thinking of the death of the body. And indeed it is hardly possible that there can be any thorough dying to the old self unless it includes willingness to face physical death if God so call a man. That was indeed S. Paul's mind too, and for himself he did not always think of death as an evil, whatever he may have said in some turns of his theological arguments; see Phil. i. 21—26, and cf. Acts xx. 24.

The paradox, if it be a paradox, is indeed dissolved in the light of ordinary life. In quiet times death may appear as the unfortunate cutting short of pleasure or usefulness, the disease of mortal nature, the penalty of man's sinful condition. But at other times death for a man's country, for a cause, for "Christ's sake and the gospel" can well be looked upon as divinely destined completion, "perfection," of a man's life soul self, his "gaining of soul." It was in a time of severe trial that it was said of the righteous man: "Being made perfect in a little while he fulfilled long years," Wisdom iv. 13. "Trial," "temptation," generally bears this intense signification in the New Testament. Probably it does in the Lord's Prayer, and "Lead us not into temptation" ought to be interpreted by the standard of the cross "where,"—so sang Dr Watts in the same spirit as the Book of Wisdom—"where the young Prince of Glory died." If we are not quite wrong in the setting we have decided upon for Hebrews, "temptation" bears the intense meaning there, and readers who might soon be "resisting unto blood" themselves would be the more apt to appreciate the pregnant issues of a heroic death.

Now transpose the key. Still remembering how great and hopeful a crown of life is a heroic death, think not of heroism but of the perfecting of all the "goodness" of our Lord Jesus

in His death. Then these words of Dr DuBose will seem grounded in reverent reason: "The death of Jesus Christ was no mere incident or accident of His human career. It was the essential thing in it, as what it means for us all is the essential thing in human life and destiny," for "the mystery of man is the mystery of death, and the mystery of death is the mystery of man; each is interpretative and explanatory of the other."

§ 15. *Third element in Christ's priesthood, approach to God. By the way He went and is men too must go: He re-enacts achievement in them.*

"What it means for us all" is the forgiveness of sin, that is the cleansing and cleansing away of sin, and in consequence our unimpeded access to the presence of God. "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which he dedicated for us, a new and living way through the veil, that is to say, the way of his flesh; and having a great priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with pure water," x. 19—22. Here is our fourth key-word, "way." And, according to the translation here adopted and justified in the note on the passage, this way is the way of our Lord's flesh, i.e. we men must in our own lives re-enact, or have re-enacted in us, that "perfecting" which our Lord went through in His earthly life.

Now it may be that again in this connexion we ought to bear in mind the limits of our faculty for reasoning things out. It may be that there are phrases in the epistle which hint at depths beyond the reach of our plummet. And of course all the thoughts of the epistle are, as Origen recognised, "wonderful," outrunning our thought. Still it is evident that on the whole the author does mean us to believe that our sin is forgiven and the entrance is opened for us by an act of God in Christ which He enables us to make our own. The salvation is not worked upon us from outside as by a ritual ordinance. It is worked by inward moral connexion, as by a person influencing persons. The divine "way" is not a higher thing than influence. If it were it would be indeed beyond our

understanding, but it would be also, as far as we can in any manner conceive, incapable of producing any effect upon us worthy of a personal, or, as the epistle puts it, of the living God. Christ enables men to be "perfected" when they pass along the way He made His own in His flesh. Only the perfection, the Godhead which, from the point of view taken in the epistle after the opening verses have removed the possibility of misconstruction, He attained, has raised His "influence" to such a pitch that this way may be represented not as "His own" but as "Himself": "for we are become partakers of the Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end," iii. 14. And with regard to that preliminary of perfection, the forgiveness of sin, a like process may be recognised. Sin is forgiven in being cleansed away. "Cleansed away" is part of the ritual imagery, and the author applies that imagery very boldly in vii. 27; see p. lx above. Changing the metaphor—all language is but more or less metaphorical—and ignoring the details of ritual correspondence, we may suppose him to mean, not merely that our Lord bore our sins, but that He, as much as we, had to "overcome" sin, being as He was "tempted in all points like as we are." The result of that overcoming and its effect for His "brethren" has been set forth so well by Dr DuBose that it would only be darkening counsel to seek for other words:

I do not know how better to express the truth of the matter than to say, in what seems to me to be the explicit teaching of our Epistle, and of the New Testament generally, that our Lord's whole relation to sin in our behalf was identical with our own up to the point of His unique and exceptional personal action with reference to it. Left to our nature and ourselves it overcomes and slays all us; through God in Him He overcame and slew it. He did it not by His own will and power as man, but as man through an absolute dependence upon God. And He made both the omnipotent grace of God upon which He depended, and His own absolute dependence upon it, His perfect faith, available for us in our salvation. He re-enacts in us the victory over sin and death which was first enacted in Himself.

That is what the epistle would seem to mean by the phrase in ix. 12, "Christ through his own blood, entered in once

for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption."

§ 16. *This interaction of men with God is illustrated by the doctrine of the Covenant which the author develops from Jeremiah. His affinity with Jeremiah in respect of forgiveness, national crisis, freedom from religious bondage.*

That this interaction of man with God through Christ in the work of salvation is according to the mind of the epistle appears in its treatment of the Covenant in chapter viii., and of the Will in chapter x. The Covenant forms the transition from "priesthood" to the "priestly sacrifice" (ix.), and the passage about God's Will sums up the whole of the previous argument, and leads on to the appeal (x. 19 ff.) with which the final, practical section of the epistle begins.

The word *diathēkē* by which the LXX translates the Hebrew *Berith*, means in Greek generally, though not always, a testamentary disposition rather than a covenant; and it is possible that this meaning has to some extent shaped the author's phraseology in ix. 15—17. It is not however necessary to resort to that explanation of the passage, since the sacrifices with which God's covenants with His people were inaugurated, from Sinai to the Last Supper, sufficiently account for all that is there said. Some are of the opinion that the choice of *diathēkē* "disposition" instead of *synthēkē* "agreement" in the LXX was meant to vindicate the peculiar character of the divine covenant, as originating from God and not as a merely mutual agreement between equals. That character of course it has, in accordance with the principle which underlies not this epistle only, but the whole New Testament and Old Testament also; the principle so forcibly enunciated by S. Paul in Rom. viii. 12, "So then, brethren, we are debtors," but quite as plainly in Ex. xx. 2 f., "I am the LORD thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have none other gods before me." Nevertheless though not "merely" mutual, the divine covenant is a covenant, and mutual relations are its essence. In the quotation made by our author from Jer. xxxi. 31—34 this mutuality is emphasised by his

use of the Greek instead of the Hebrew Bible. Where the Hebrew said "Which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband to them, saith the LORD," his quotation from the LXX has "For they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not." No one who interprets the details of Holy Scripture by the whole will suppose this to mean that God changed from love to indifference, but it does illustrate the principle we have been examining, viz. that salvation is an act of God on man as well as for him, and that the very nature of God and man makes it impossible for God's forgiveness, though God unceasingly forgives, to operate except when men answer personally to His personal influence.

And it is clear that our author meant to bring the Covenant to bear on his doctrine of forgiveness especially. That was one reason why he chose to quote from Jeremiah rather than from any other part of the Old Testament. For Jeremiah's oracle ends emphatically with forgiveness (Heb. viii. 12), and it is just those words in the quotation which are repeated in x. 17, at the end of the paragraph on the Will. But there were other reasons also for the choice. One was, we may suppose, that the occasion of Jeremiah's utterance was so like the occasion of this letter. Jeremiah spoke when Jerusalem was about to fall before Nebuchadnezzar; this letter was probably written when the war with Rome was breaking out which was to end in the calamity of A.D. 70. Then again Jeremiah spoke of a "new" covenant, and it was the renewal of the ancient covenant which our Lord inaugurated in His Blood at the Last Supper; see especially Luke xxii. 20. One chief reason against laying stress on the coincidences of Heb. ix. 15—17 with the language of testamentary law is that the governing thought which underlies the whole is not Roman law, but Christ's fulfilling of Israel's covenant hope on the night in which He was betrayed and the day on which He died.

But above all, because it is the idea which pervades and vivifies all the rest, Jeremiah's words are chosen as expressing that ascent from shadow to reality which is the doctrinal theme of this epistle, as it was the special revelation committed to Jeremiah. Both authors wrote at a crisis when the

institutional form of religion was being broken up. To those whom they addressed this might well seem the end of religion itself. In the narrower sense of the word religion—scrupulous reverence—it was almost an end. But with the loss of outward bonds to God, Jeremiah saw the vision of a real union of the heart between Israel and God. And to some extent his vision was realised; as in the Psalter of the post-exilic Jewish Church. Yet on another side the increasing domination of the Law made the later Jewish Church more institutionally scrupulous than before. And when Hebrews was written not only did the war with Rome threaten an abolition of these institutional bonds, but the larger spirit of Judaism itself was fretting to be free from them. The author, being a real churchman, would assure his friends, who as yet are so imperfect churchmen, that in Jesus Christ the whole difficulty is more than overcome. Quite freed from all the hamper of artificial religion, which is worn out and passing away, they may enjoy real forgiveness and enter really into the presence of God. The New Covenant of the heart is now being realised. Only it is a covenant. There must be an answer to the movement of God. And for these friends of his the answer must be given in the courageous acceptance of a dangerous duty, a painful dissociation from venerable traditions and ancestral friendships.

That practical appeal continually breaks in. It lends an ominous undertone to many phrases which have primarily a theological purpose. Thus ix. 22, "And apart from shedding of blood there is no remission," must be interpreted not only in the light of the doctrine of sacrifice generally, or of Christ's sacrifice eminently, but also of that sacrifice which was then being demanded from the readers, and is darkly foreshadowed in xii. 4, "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood." These men could not refuse to join the revolutionary standard without incurring the murderous resentment of their compatriots. All the more honourable was their willingness to listen to so academically reasoned a persuasion as their master sends them. If in his time of trial Jeremiah lifted some Judaeans from religion to heart-religion, this letter lifts its readers from religion to theology. "'Theology,'" wrote Forbes Robinson,

"is *the* thing and 'Religion' is not, I think, nearly such a fine word. Theology is the Learning, Knowing, Studying God¹." Hebrews, a letter to men who may soon be martyrs, testifies more than any other book of the New Testament to the moral force of good theology.

§ 17. *This thought of interaction is carried further in the doctrine of the Will:*

The mutual, personal significance of the Covenant is developed in x. 1—18 into the still intenser theology of the Will. A short passage concerning the old sacrifices introduces this. The obvious purpose is to contrast the fictional value of a brute's blood with the real value of a person's willing act. But what has just been said about "undertones" applies here too. After all there was something not altogether unreal in these fictional sacrifices. They "called to mind"; they moved the heart. By the mere "doing" of these sacrifices nothing would ever be produced like in kind to the sacrifice of Christ. Yet the offerers wanted to become like Christ; good priests led priestly lives and helped Israelites to become like Christ; they, as well as the writer of this epistle, could deduce Christlike teaching from their sacrificial system. Another quotation from Mr Forbes Robinson well expresses this quasi-typical relationship of the Jewish sacrificial law. "It dimly hints (as sacrificial law in other nations does) at the fact that the ground of the universe is self-sacrifice—that the ground of all human, whether family or national, life is a filial sacrifice."

The Psalms however touch the reality which the Law "dimly hints." And from a psalm the author takes words which he could place quite appropriately into the mouth of our Lord as He entered upon His ministry, a ministry which overpassed the artificial bounds of Judaism, and was to transform the whole world (x. 5). "I come," He said, "to do thy will, O God." The ritual imagery is for a moment dropped. The argument winds inward to the soul of truth. Christ did God's will. There was His sacrifice. That sacrifice

¹ *Letters to his Friends, by Forbes Robinson, p. 67.*

becomes real for us when we make it our own by doing God's will as He did. Yet the two efforts, His and ours, even before they coincide, are not separate. For here is the secret power of influence again. Once He had perfectly done God's will, it became more possible for us to attempt the same, at last possible for us to succeed. That secret power is deep in the constitution of the ordered universe, the "cosmos." For in the cosmos there is but one real will, namely God's. Self will, or feeble will, in men is but their refusal of absolutely free will. For absolute freedom is security in God from all the obligations of shifting slaveries (cf. ii. 15). If, leaving what we fancy to be our private wills, we enter God's will, we are borne irresistibly on therein, "consecrated" to perfect activity; and this entry into God's will has been opened for us by the sacrifice of Christ. He having learned obedience by suffering, at last, at the moment of His final obedience, lost and found His will perfectly in God's. That uniquely perfect consecration of a man's will to God, one perfected Son's to the Father of all, has had supreme influence; it has, so to say, righted the tottering destiny of man. From that moment the ideal of perfect consecration has been brought again within the range of men's practical aim. Yet, since that aim is practical, they must submit to the discipline of gradually working it out.

§ 18. *which in this epistle is concentrated upon the one act of will, first wrought by Christ in dying, now to be made their own in the particular duty of the readers.*

Thus perhaps we may paraphrase the carefully distinguished tenses, "we have been sanctified" (with the supplement "through the offering...once for all," cf. vii. 27, ix. 12, 26, 28), "he hath perfected them that are sanctified." With the idea, here suggested, of that last present participle compare "working in us" in the final blessing, xiii. 20 f. That may be taken to imply that, whereas the writer prays for his friends that they may do their one hard duty and so enter the will of God, he himself has already made that entry, and would have God carry on his gradual sanctification. A like

thought of gradual sanctification may be involved in the two participles of ii. 11, "he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified," and again in the present tense of "do enter" of iv. 3 as contrasted with the immediately preceding aorist "have believed," "we who made the initial entry into God's will when we embraced the faith of the Church are continually pressing deeper into the peace of that will." For the two chapters on the Rest of God contain a preliminary sketch of the doctrine of God's will; cf. ii., iii. with x., and (as illustrative parallel) Dante's "*E la sua volontate è nostra pace*" with S. Augustine's "*Quia fecisti nos ad te, et inquietum est cor nostrum donec requiescat in te.*"

Yet it must remain doubtful whether this thought of gradual sanctification is in harmony with the mind of this epistle; whether these present tenses are not more properly interpreted, in this epistle, of the one great conversion of will, repeated in all those who from time to time are brought into the allegiance of Christ. For, true though the other thought is generally, in this epistle the stress is almost entirely on the one decisive act. The one moment of Christ's offering His sacrifice, the one sin which may prove irreparable, the one brave act of duty which the readers are called to perform: these are the eminent ideas, and the last of them explains why. This epistle was written with one special purpose, to induce certain waverers to become by one decisive act whole-hearted followers of Christ, and this purpose moulds the whole shape of its theology.

Thus S. Paul's doctrine of the faithful being "in Christ" is known to our author, but is not much dwelt upon in the epistle. It would naturally be known to him, for S. Paul, who made it so vital and profound, did not discover it, but with the whole of the primitive Church inherited it from Judaism. "The Christ of the LORD" had been to early Israel the king who represented the nation. Sometimes it was used as a title for the nation itself. So this author uses it, of course with a widening of the original application, in his quotation from Ps. lxxxix. 50 f. in xi. 26. In the later Jewish Church "The Christ" was recognised as a person, the King of the expected kingdom of Heaven, but the idea of inclusive representation

was preserved. There was no Christ apart from his people, and, as in Dan. vii., he could be considered as almost embodying in himself "the saints of the Most High" who were to "possess the kingdom for ever." This conception of the Christ including all the faithful, "the Christ that is to be," was grandly developed by S. Paul in the epistle to the Ephesians¹. In Hebrews it appears more nearly in its Jewish simplicity, as in iii. 14, "For we are become partakers of the Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end." Here we have the "in Christ" doctrine, but it is coupled with an "if," and that "if" is just what prevents the writer from developing it further. He had to concentrate all his might on the preliminary task of urging his friends to make the doctrine their own by loyalty to Jesus Christ,—a particular act of loyalty to the definitely envisaged person of the Lord. S. Paul, even in our author's place, might have preferred to say, "Believe that you are in Christ and you will be able to do this hard duty." Our author found it better to say, "Follow Christ loyally, do this duty, and you will know what it is to share with Him the peace of God."

His way may seem a lower way than S. Paul's. But it ought not to be so understood. His trust in the all-embracing will of God, and in the already perfected sacrifice of Christ, allows him to lay this emphasis on duty. Though he urges his friends to make their effort, he is aware of all that is being divinely done for them; their effort will not be the initial impulse in the whole complex purpose of God for their salvation. And he knew his friends, and knew what arguments would best prevail with them. They were men of fine and romantic honour and the appeal to loyalty would come home to them. Their conception of the mystery of Christ's Person was imperfect, and they could not understand properly what "in Christ" implied. Their interest in His earthly life, and the imaginative form which, if the epistle was congenial to them, thought seems to have generally taken in their minds, all this was good reason for pressing the romantic, imaginative, sacramental idea of following Christ, rather than the mystical idea of union in Christ.

¹ See the *Commentary* and the *Exposition* by the Dean of Wells.

§ 19. *And such concentration was natural in the crisis which the author recognised as a "coming" of Christ.*

And there was yet another peculiarity in their circumstances which made them apt to be "followers" of Christ as "captain" (cf. ii. 10, xii. 2). In the troubles of these times He was "coming," and He was coming to call His soldiers after Him. That is a picture which is repeatedly presented in the Apocalypse. If the Apocalypse and Hebrews be not both connected with the revolt against Rome, it is at least evident that they are both connected with some crisis of like character. In the eschatological discourse of our Lord which precedes the Passion in each of the synoptic Gospels, it is difficult to avoid recognising a premonition of the fall of Jerusalem mingling with the prophecy of the final "coming" of the Son of man. Nor is it unreasonable to suppose that our Lord and other observers of the signs of the times foresaw such a conclusion to the increasing zeal of the patriots. In S. Luke's version of the discourse it seems plain that a prediction of the fall of Jerusalem is followed and completed by a prediction of the great Advent. That advent filled the horizon of the early Church. Had one of its members been asked, What is the Christian hope? he would have answered without hesitation, The coming of our Lord as Christ. And that is the hope which fills this epistle. But it is no longer a hope for the quite near future; as it was when S. Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, but not when he wrote to the Ephesians. In Hebrews, as in Ephesians, a vista opens into a long future for the Church. Writer and readers are breaking with a past which is dear to them, but regret is transformed into a vigorous outlook upon a new world (cf. "the world to come, whereof we speak," ii. 5). When once the "temptation" is over, youth will be renewed under the banner of Jesus Christ (cf. note on xii. 24). And to the writer, as to S. Luke, the revelation has occurred, that "the advent" is a mystery with many senses. Whatever the great final "coming" may be, Christ can come at another time and in another way; and in the then imminent crisis he believed that Christ was really coming. That seems the evident meaning of x. 25, "...ex-

horting one another; and so much the more, as ye see the day drawing nigh." In the atmosphere of this thought we catch undertones—such as we have already observed to be natural to our author—in i. 6, "when he again bringeth in the firstborn into the world," or even ix. 28, "so Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for him, unto salvation."

§ 20. *This crisis explains the three passages in which repentance seems to be limited.*

A crisis was at hand. In that crisis Christ was coming; it was, so to say, the first stage in the realisation of all that the traditional hope of His advent meant. The crisis would bring the readers of the epistle face to face with a definite choice between loyalty to Him and apostasy. The choice was of infinite importance; its effects would reach into the sphere of eternal realities; if they made the wrong choice it was more than uncertain whether they would ever find opportunity for correcting it. Take no thought for doubtful morrows but do your duty to-day, is the burden of the letter. And this concentrated anxiety of the writer for his friends explains those three remarkable passages, vi. 4—8, x. 26—31, xii. 16 f., in which he might seem to be denying the possibility of repeated repentance. If the letter were a general treatise of theology, laying down general rules for all Christians of all times, it would be natural to interpret his words in that manner. The special occasion of this, not treatise but letter, makes all the difference.

Nevertheless "no second repentance" has been understood at different times to be his teaching (cf. Intr. II. §§ 3, 13, pp. xxv f., xliv ff.). Tertullian so understood him. So does his latest commentator Dr Windisch, whose detached note on "The denial of the second repentance" is a valuable summary of material for forming a judgement on the question. He argues that the rigour of Hebrews was a logical development of the original principle of the Church. This principle was inherited from the Old Testament. The Law had allowed no forgiveness for any but sins "of ignorance"; see e.g. Num.

xv. 28—31. Ezekiel implies the same in his chapter, xviii., on the wicked man turning away from his wickedness and finding life. This inherited principle had been intensified by the eschatology from which the gospel started; when the Kingdom, into which the Christian was called, was immediately expected, there was no "place for repentance" after the one absolute repentance which constituted his entry into the Kingdom. S. Paul implicitly, and without perhaps conscious reflexion on the problem, held the same doctrine. That is evident from 2 Cor. vii. 10, "For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death" (so our A.V. but see R.V.). And though it cannot be said that this austere rule was universal in the primitive Church, we do find it again in 1 John v. 16 f., "If any man see his brother sinning a sin not unto death, he shall ask, and God will give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: not concerning this do I say that he should make request. All unrighteousness is sin: and there is a sin not unto death." This precept is probably connected with the passages in Hebrews, and with our Lord's word about the sin against the Holy Ghost. In fact the proclamation of forgiveness for all the world through the death of Christ involved constancy as an inherent condition. A second repentance for those who fell away from the new life thus given was impossible, except by some special command from God himself. Such special command, for a certain limited period, was declared in the Apocalypse (ii. 5, 16, 21 f., iii. 3, 15—19; cf. xiv. 6 f.), and some years later in the Shepherd of Hermas. Yet even this was but a particular indulgence, a second repentance, not a repentance that might be repeated yet again. On the other hand the epistle of Clement of Rome witnesses to a milder doctrine which was accepted in a large part of the early Church, and which became presently the general rule. The Fathers explain away the rigour of Hebrews by interpreting its language as denying second baptism but not repeated repentance.

It would not be fair to decide for or against Dr Windisch from this free sketch of his argument. Yet his hard literalism

is evident. In the notes on Heb. vi. 4 ff. reasons will be found for supposing that the question of "second repentance" is not raised by this passage at all. The readers had been wondering whether they had not better go back to the simplicity of their ancestral Jewish faith and find a good practical "repentance" in so doing. Their friend tells them that this would be in the nature of things impossible, since to do this would be to dishonour the allegiance they have already given to Jesus as Christ. Plain honour demands faithfulness to Him. No complicated doubts about other claims of honour can annul that claim. How is it conceivable then that a new and better life can be attained in a continued state of base apostasy? A quotation Dr Windisch makes from Philo—different though his application of Philo's thought is—may be used to describe the situation: "he who asks oblivion for what he has done wrong is not so perverse as to go on with new offences at the very time he is asking to be freed from the old," *de spec. leg.* i. 193, p. 240.

This explanation of Heb. vi. 4 ff. will hardly win assent from those who recognise no connexion between the epistle and the Jewish revolt. But if any other severe crisis be taken as the occasion of writing, it will be easy to understand all the three passages on repentance in a different sense from Dr Windisch. The author is not enunciating a rule of church discipline. He is impressing the extreme peril of the situation upon his own friends. Nothing, he urges, can be compared with the gravity of this choice before you. The wrong choice will be a grievous sin. It is the one sin in all the world for you, and this choice is your one great chance. The time is perilous. In the coming disturbances you may die, or you may be involved in an inextricable tangle of evil. You will certainly not have another chance of Christian nobility like this; it may well prove that, this neglected, you may never find the opportunity again of salvation through Christ whom you now dishonour¹.

¹ When these lines were being written a parallel was offered in the Archbishop of Canterbury's sermon in Westminster Abbey, Sunday Oct. 1, 1916—the opening message of the National Mission of Repentance and Hope: "It seems to me almost certain

§ 21. *Repentance is based upon the sacrifice offered once for all, which nevertheless must be repeated in each disciple.*

In the prayer, xiii. 20 f., with which the author concludes, the sacramental correspondence is recapitulated between the trial and the one decisive victory of the Lord Jesus in His earthly life, and the trial through which the readers are going and the one decisive duty they have to do. And the sacrificial aspect of the victory is presented in the phrase "in the blood of the eternal covenant." This pre-occupation with the need of one decisive act of will on the part of his friends may have been part of the impulse which led the writer to select the analogy of priesthood for his fresh exposition of the traditional doctrine of Christ's Person and work. For a sacrifice is an offering. The essential, generous work of a priest is to offer gifts, v. 1. It is involved in the very idea of a gift, an offering, a sacrifice, that it should be given "once for all." If it could be repeated that would mean that something had been kept back in the first giving. So far then as the analogy goes there could be but one sacrifice of Christ, offered once for all. And there is more than the truth of analogy in this. There is the emotional truth that this sacrifice, being what it was, the dreadful crucifixion, cannot be thought of as repeated, ix. 26, and even the prolongation of it, as it were (vi. 6), by men's continued or repeated unfaithfulness would be a horrible thing. And there is the satisfaction of our need for full assurance of full free pardon; the sacrifice is "full, perfect and sufficient," x. 14, ix. 14. Hence the greatest stress is laid in the epistle on this offering once for all. There is no repetition; nor can the sacrifice be styled "eternal," since such an epithet might, by confusion between its temporal and moral senses, lead to misunderstanding. In ix. 14 "through eternal Spirit" could not be changed into "for ever" without ambiguity.

Nevertheless something is implied in "through eternal" that if this opportunity goes by unused, it can never, never come again. Wait till six months after the war is over, and the new start, possible now, will be unattainable. At present all is tense and keen; the spirit of sacrifice, the spirit of readiness to offer ourselves and what we love, is 'in the air.'" *Times*, Oct. 2, 1916.

Spirit" which obliges us to consider rather more carefully what we mean when we assert that the sacrifice of Christ is neither repeated nor continuous. The argument from the nature of a gift or offering becomes fallacious as soon as the offering is pictured in the mind materially and the material picture allowed to direct our moral apprehension of the truth. If we think of Christ's sacrifice as it was sacramentally worked out on earth, it culminates in the moment of His death. If we insist on the ritual imagery, that moment is alone the moment of sacrifice. But if we let the ritual imagery go and think of what Christ did for our salvation in His earthly course, it seems highly artificial to separate His teaching, obedience, faith and suffering from His death, as though the ministry were merely moral, the death alone effectual. For what is "merely moral"? And how does "moral" differ from "spiritual"? And how can a single act be cut away from the whole process of character? In like manner we may imagine Christ's heavenly work beginning at the moment of His death, now pictured as His entrance into the presence of God. At that moment He "offers," and the offering is completed. But just as to S. Paul He who was once crucified abides for evermore "the crucified one," so we may think of the High Priest abiding for ever in the state of "one who has offered." That is to say in modern phrase, "He pleads the sacrifice"; in the words of the epistle, "He ever liveth to make intercession for us." But how difficult it is to explain what we mean by the intercession or the pleading as distinct from the offering. We try to do so, and fail. The suspicion will occur to us that we are trying to do an impossible thing, viz. to express what is spiritually real as a whole, in the analytic language of "appearance." So it is when we ask, Was there a beginning of time? Is there a boundary to space? and (must we not add?) "When did our Lord become High Priest?" In ii. 17 ("to make propitiation") the present tense of the Greek verb is much to be noticed. There, at any rate, though a ritual term is employed and Christ's work is conceived as "propitiation" rather than "salvation," it is not contemplated as an instantaneous process.

Of that word however Dr DuBose writes thus: "The use of

the present tense, instead of the aorist, expresses the fact that Christ's single, and once for all completed, act of (on the part of humanity) self-reconciliation or at-one-ment with God, is continuously being re-enacted in and by us, as we by His enabling grace and aid are enduring temptation and attaining victory, are dying His death and rising into His life." That may appear too subtle an exegesis of the isolated word. But the more the epistle is studied as a whole, the more reasonable, after all, will it prove. As S. Paul, using the figure of birth, writes to the Galatians as though Christ should be born again in them, Gal. iv. 19, so this author, using the figure of priesthood, writes to his friends as though they were in their own persons to offer the sacrifice of Christ again; notice especially xiii. 12 f. The parallel is the closer because the Galatians, like these readers, were already Christians but needed to make a fresh definite choice of action if they were to be fully Christian. "My little children, of whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you," is exactly like "Since Jesus suffered sacrificially without the gate, let us go forth unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach." How far the author of Hebrews was influenced in the conduct of his analogy from priesthood by the eucharistic service of the Church is a doubtful, if it is even a proper question. But in the eucharistic service of the Church in England there is a striking illustration of this idea of the repeating of the one completed sacrifice in the persons of the worshippers. In the prayer of consecration memorial and dramatic representation is made of the "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice," as it was first prefigured by the Saviour himself at the Last Supper; in the following prayer that sacrifice is re-enacted in the words "And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable holy and lively sacrifice unto thee." In this prayer it is made clear, as in the epistle, that the re-enacting depends on the preceding completion. It might be suspected that the separation of the second prayer from the first, with which it was originally combined, is an instance of that bondage to the analogy and that inopportune logical analysis which have unnecessarily multiplied the theological problems of the epistle.

§ 22. *And though, after that initial re-enacting of the one sacrifice, S. Paul, S. John and Hebrews uphold the ideal of sinlessness, they acknowledge means for the renewal of the faithful if they do sin.*

The truth might be put in this way. Though, on the one hand, the epistle represents Christ's priesthood as culminating in the one sacrifice, and concentrates its exhortation on the one duty of the readers, yet on the other hand, Christ's priesthood as a whole is its theme, and it was recognised as a canonical scripture in virtue of its universal appeal. So regarded, the narrower view of its doctrine of repentance appears impossible. How can that view be thought consistent with vii. 24 f.? "But he, because he abideth for ever, hath his priesthood unchangeable. Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through Him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." The words are as wide as those of our Lord, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest...and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out," Matt. xi. 28, John vi. 37. Neither in this epistle, nor elsewhere in the New Testament, is the rule of ecclesiastical discipline provided. All still moves in the region of ideals. And the difficulty is not in the stern denial of repentance but in the unattainable (as it seems to us) hope of perfection.

S. Paul takes for granted that Christians have really risen to a new life in Christ and are really free from sin. His converts did sin, and he deals with their sins as he is inspired to deal with them severally, cf. 1 Cor. v. 4 f. with 1 Cor. vii. 6, 25. He goes so far as to deliver an unrepentant member of the Church "unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus," 1 Cor. v. 5. And as soon as an obstinate sinner does repent he rejoices in his restoration, 2 Cor. ii. 5 ff. In this case extreme measures appear to have been taken which were not generally necessary. The main point is that in S. Paul's epistles we see Christians guilty of sins, and yet the apostle abates nothing of his ideal of perfect holiness. He is not laying down a rule, but undauntedly insisting on the true life

with its immense hopefulness. In the first epistle of S. John the same ideal is insisted upon. By this time the ardour of first conversion is no longer universal in the Church and a two-fold difficulty is arising. Commonplace sins are frequent, and since these are inconsistent with the ideal, some are inclined to maintain that such faults are not actual sins. S. John answers that they are, and that whenever a man commits them he falls out of the new life into which he has been born: yet through confession he may be restored and through the blood of Jesus he may more and more be cleansed from all sin. And there is no need for Christians to sin; his letter is written that they may not sin. If they will but be true to the power of the new birth they will not sin: 1 John i. 7—10, ii. 1, iii. 4—6, v. 18. But, secondly, Christians are sometimes guilty of such sin that it is plain they intend to persist in it, so plain that there would be insincerity in praying for them. To this S. John does not answer "You must not pray for them," but very guardedly, "There is a sin unto death: not concerning this do I say that one should make request." He recognises the real difficulty, and insists upon sincerity in intercession. Whether there would be any limit to his own intercession he does not say.

Hebrews stands in a manner outside this line of development because of the very special circumstances which called it forth. But in the important matter of the ideal the author is entirely at one with S. Paul and S. John. There is no faltering in his hope. Christ's redemption (ix. 12), salvation (i. 14), kingdom (xii. 28), sacrifice, all mean that Christians like Christ are to be perfect. If we ask in astonishment whether it is really to be supposed possible that a man should go through his whole earthly life without any sin, we are indeed involved in a difficulty, for our Lord did nothing less than that. But it is not the interesting practical question. Our Lord did indeed no less than that, but He did so much more. His progress ending in perfection; His being "without sin" and learning obedience till at last He was "separated from sinners" (iv. 15, vii. 26; cf. ix. 28); this is the great pattern. There is the same paradox; He is one with men yet supreme among them, in this matter of sinlessness as in the

whole mystery of His Person. Yet that does not make the union unreal. The unreality comes in from our reasoning by negatives. It is transmuted when we act upon the bold hope. One who strove manfully for right and conquered sins one by one in himself, would obviously be nearer to the perfect goodness of Christ, than one who committed no "sin" and lived a useless ignoble life.

§ 23. *Is this re-enacting of Christ's sacrifice accomplished in the death of self-will, or is bodily death the ultimate necessity? In the apostolic age this question would not seem important.*

Or we may put it thus: our perfection is the ideal which we go through life to realise; but the Lord Jesus, as man, achieved that ideal: ii. 8 f., x. 9 f., 14. Does the epistle promise that we may in this life realise the ideal? In 1 John iii. 2 f. the realisation seems to wait till the great Advent. "Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him even as he is. And every one that hath this hope set on him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." S. John substitutes "manifestation," or the shewing of One already present but invisible, for "advent," as of One coming from another place; but no doubt he has the great final manifestation in view¹. With this we may compare Heb. ix. 28. But in xii. 23 another thought appears. In the heavenly Jerusalem there are already "the spirits of just men made perfect." Mr F. Field wrote of this²: "To avoid ambiguity a slight change is necessary; namely 'to the spirits of just men who have been made perfect.' It is the *just men*, not the *spirits*, that are made perfect, and that not in the future state, but here on earth, where alone they can be subject to those trials and conflicts, by the patient endurance of which they are prepared for a higher state of being." He quotes examples of misunderstanding of the English version. One from Arch-

¹ See Dr Brooke's note on the passage in the *International Critical Commentary*, and especially p. xxi of his Introduction.

² *Notes on Translation of the New Testament*. Cambridge University Press, 1899.

bishop Sumner's *Exposition on Ephesians* will here suffice: "The inheritance of the purchased possession when 'the spirits of just men' will be 'made perfect,' no longer clouded by the pains and anxieties which attend a fallen state." Sumner is certainly wrong and Field right. Yet there was possibly something in the author's mind which he has missed. There is in the epistle, combined with the idea of progressive discipline and progressive salvation, that other line of thought in which stress is laid on the decisive, culminating moment. It would seem that death, as the crowning act of life, is considered to be the moment of a man's perfecting. At death, or through death, the ideal is realised. This is well put by a writer in the *Cowley Evangelist*, April 1895 (reprinted July 1914):

Our Lord is leading all who are following the movements of His Holy Spirit to the *true balance* of their being. Some He deals with more strenuously and rapidly by giving them early opportunities of embracing His will, when to do so means to embrace what is hard for flesh and blood; but sooner or later, if life is here at all prolonged, there must come the occasion when the will either surrenders itself afresh to Him in some time of great trial, or sinks back upon itself, only too soon to energize in movements of rebellion against the Divine will. It is by such ways that He reveals to men that they cannot "live by bread alone, but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God." They are led a step nearer to the perception of what it is to be nourished by God's very life in the abeyance of all else. And all are being led to this attitude who rightly are preparing for the end, for this abeyance is a marked characteristic of death, and will be, to such as are prepared to receive it, the *blessing* which accompanies death's chastening discipline.

Almost every sentence in this quotation illustrates some point in the practical or the doctrinal exhortations of the epistle. And it indicates a right answer to a question which will have already occurred to any one who reads these notes, viz. Is the sacrifice in which we re-enact the sacrifice of Christ effected by bodily death only or also by the death of our self-will? S. Paul would surely say that it is certainly by the death of our self-will: "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that

life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me," Gal. ii. 20. The same answer, implied by the whole of this epistle, becomes explicit in xi. 17, where the change from the aorist of LXX to the perfect "hath offered" of the quotation seems designed to shew the reality, and the abiding reality, of the sacrifice of Isaac. Isaac was not slain, but he was truly sacrificed, and that sacrifice has become the type of the consecrated life of the Israel of God, and of every losing and finding of man's will in the will of God which shall have been consummated since.

Indeed the question would have been less insistent to the New Testament writers than it is to us. To them the great day for each believer was "the day" of Christ's advent or manifestation, not the day of death. And to them the life that is hid with Christ in God was so absolutely the only real life, that death was quite naturally contemplated as one act, however decisive, in the unbroken life, already being lived, of eternity. Whether that decisive act came through the "chastening discipline" of physical death, or of some earlier hour of supreme renunciation, was hardly a distinction to be dwelt upon. Perhaps in quiet times it would seem the one, in times of persecution and martyrdom the other. And, if our hypothesis be accepted, Hebrews was written at a time when martyrdom threatened. Hence in Hebrews the solemn thought of—what we should call—literal death is never far from the surface. That kind of death is chiefly glorified in this epistle; it is the longed-for "perfecting." Cf. § 14, p. lxxiv f.

Yet it should also be noticed that in xi. 39 f. the Old Testament saints, celebrated in the whole preceding chapter, are said either to have waited for their perfecting till the times of Christ; or to be still waiting, in at least partial dependence on the faithfulness of the then "militant" generation, as contributing to their perfection. With the former explanation it might seem apposite to compare 1 Pet. iii. 18 ff. Yet that is an imperfect parallel, since the heroes of Hebrews are very different from the spirits, once disobedient, in prison. And the picture which immediately follows in Heb. xii. 1 ff., of the contest to be endured by

Christ's followers on earth and witnessed to by these heroes in their state of waiting, lends probability to the latter. The inconsistency vanishes if, as the arrangement of clauses in xii. 22 ff. also indicates, "the spirits of just men made perfect" are the deceased members of the Christian Church.

§ 24. *In Hebrews, as in Apocalypse, special interest in the blessed dead is shewn. The general doctrine of N.T. on this subject.*

Or perhaps Christian martyrs in particular. Among other points of contact between Hebrews and the Apocalypse is their common interest in the blessed dead. Between the writing of 1 Cor. xv. and of these two books something has happened which has multiplied, or is multiplying, the number of deceased Christians. And there are four passages in the Apocalypse which throw light on the language of Hebrews:

- (1) vi. 6-10, the vision of "the souls" under the altar, the martyred prophets of the Old Covenant, who were to wait till the complement of the martyrs of the New had come in. For as Heb. xi. 40 says, "they apart from us" cannot "be made perfect." These are clothed in white raiment and are, I imagine, merged in those who keep coming out of the great tribulation, also arrayed in white robes in vii. 13 ff., to be shepherded by the Lamb.
- (2) Look next at xiv. 13. "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord from this time forth. Yea, saith the Spirit, may they rest from their toiling, for their works follow with them." This rest is not inactivity. Their powers trained by their earthly activities are from henceforth to find full scope without friction.
- (3) When we pass on to xix. 14, we are given a vision of the armies that are in heaven riding on white horses, clothed in the vesture of the Bride of the Lamb, going out to fight under their Captain Christ.
- (4) Then in xx. 4 we come back once more to the Christian martyrs, who have been faithful in their witness, and who live and reign with Christ during the mystic Millennium of the chaining of Satan. This we are told is "the first Resurrection."

These paragraphs are quoted from an article in the *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1916, by Dr J. O. F. Murray, on "The Empty Tomb, the Resurrection Body and the Intermediate State." From this article, with the author's permission, some further extracts shall be made¹.

The Resurrection of Christ is the manifestation of a force in the Universe, which, because it has been seen in operation in one instance, may be trusted to work universally....But the working of the Resurrection power, which had been manifested in the raising of Christ as the first-fruits, was not to be seen in operation again until "the Appearing," and then only in the case of Christians....An intermediate state is implied, not only in the doctrine of the descent into Hades, but also in the dating of the Resurrection on the third day.

The fact seems to be that "Resurrection," like "Death" and "Life," is a term of manifold significance, and admits of many stages and degrees....The questions of practical importance for us are two...(1) Where do we stand with regard to the "Appearing" which St. Paul expected in his own generation? And (2) to what extent are we here and now contributing to the evolution of our spiritual bodies, building up "the habitation, the building from God, made without hands, eternal in the heavens," which we are to inhabit hereafter?

Here, with regard to the first point, Dr Murray calls attention to the four passages in the Apocalypse to which we referred above. He proceeds thus:

The sequence of events implied [in those four passages] seems to me remarkably parallel in general outline to the scheme laid down by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. And I am prepared to take as my working hypothesis the view that we are living now in this "Millennium": that we are or may be, in proportion to our faith, here and now citizens of the New Jerusalem, and that, again in proportion to our faith, it is true for us that "there is no more death"; that in fact our Lord's promises are strictly true: "Who-soever loseth his life for my sake finds it," not after an indefinite period, but immediately [and so S. John viii. 51, xi. 26]. Such believers have part in the first Resurrection. What further fulness of life may lie before them at the second Resurrection when the whole race reaches its consummation and each member of it is

¹ Cf. also "The Ascension and Whitsunday," by Father R. M. Benson, reprinted from "The Life beyond the grave," in *The Cowley Evangelist*, May 1915, especially pp. 108—112.

uplifted by the energy of the whole who can say?...Meanwhile they are in life not in death, and their life is not "disembodied." The souls are clothed, not naked. For them Christ has come again.

With regard to the second point: "What conception can we form of the nature of our spiritual bodies? To what extent are we here and now contributing to their evolution?," Dr Murray finds

that, in 1 Cor. xv. 42, St. Paul must mean "this life in corruptible flesh in the body of our humiliation is the sowing time, the harvest will come under the transformed conditions of the body of our glory." Certainly according to the best text he calls us expressly to begin at once to wear (xv. 49) "the image of the heavenly," an expression that corresponds closely to his injunction to us in Col. iii. 5 "to mortify our members that are upon earth...stripping off the old man with his ways of action, and clothing ourselves with the new after the image of Him that created Him," further defined as "compassion, kindness, humility, meekness," and so forth. In other words, personal character is the most practical form under which we can conceive of our spiritual body.

And we may conceive of the condition of the rest of the dead, "who lived not" and have no part in the first Resurrection, not as "disembodied," but as in various stages of imperfect, arrested or perverted, spiritual development, without as yet the organs by which they can enter into relation with the life that is life indeed. Such a view would, I think, be in harmony with such indications as the New Testament gives us. There does not seem to be anything in the New Testament to justify the view, which has no doubt coloured all our Christian thinking for centuries, that "soul and body meet again" at the Resurrection.

Dr Murray, though referring oftenest to S. Paul, attempts here to form a view that shall be harmonious with the New Testament as a whole. And according to this view Hebrews appears consistent in itself and with the other apostolic writings. If in ix. 27 judgement seems to follow immediately upon death, that judgement is in Greek *crisis*, a "distinguishing," such as Dr Murray recognises between those who have and those who have not part in the first resurrection. The "eternal judgement" of vi. 2 might be thought to stand in contrast with this as "final judgement," and if so the juxtaposition of "resurrection of the dead" might seem after

all to imply that, for that final judgement, "soul and body meet again." But the reference here is probably to Jewish rather than to Christian doctrine; "resurrection" is at any rate used in no more confined a sense here than in xi. 35; and two considerations make it improbable that the author thought of the blessed dead as obliged to wait till a "last day" for the receiving of the spiritual body. One is the phrase in xii. 23, "spirits of just men made perfect": the other is his silence concerning our Lord's resurrection "on the third day."

§ 25. *Application of general doctrine to Hebrews: "spirits" are not "disembodied."*

As for the first of these, the phrase in xii. 23 expresses "perfection." If there is anything in the epistle which corresponds to the partaking in the first resurrection it must be recognised here. But the word "spirits" might seem to contradict this. Surely not; it is our presupposition, disproved by Dr Murray's careful analysis of the evidence, that in the New Testament "intermediate" means "disembodied," which makes us fancy this. This use of "spirit" for all that is essential in man is found in the Old Testament. In Dan. iii. 86 (LXX) "spirits and souls of the righteous," Sirach xxxi. 14, and other places, it is joined with a following genitive; but in Sirach xxxix. 28, 2 Macc. iii. 24 (according to one ancient ms.) it stands absolutely. It is a natural development of the expression "living soul" for a creature endowed with animal life, and S. Paul has given it the utmost dignity by his antithesis in 1 Cor. xv. 45, "The first man Adam became a living soul. The last Adam became a life-giving spirit." Since "soul" represents the unseen natural life, in distinction from its vehicle the visible body, and since again "spirit" represents the more inward, more essential divine life in man, as distinguished from its mortal vehicle, "spirit" is especially used of men in their "freedom from the burden of the flesh." So S. Paul in 1 Cor. v. 5 would deliver the guilty man unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus; cf. 1 Pet. iv. 6. In 1 Thess. v. 23 he writes more precisely: "The God

of peace sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." That is more characteristic, for S. Paul is distinguished among New Testament writers by his almost scientific interest in psychological analysis. Our author is more concerned with essence than with entirety, and prefers to sum man up as a spirit, or as "truly himself," x. 34. Nor does he, like S. Paul, oppose "flesh" to "body" as base to noble; our Lord's earthly ministry is, in this epistle, "the days of his flesh"; and, in almost the same sense, the readers are bidden remember them that are evil entreated as being themselves also "in the body."

§ 26. *The author's silence about our Lord's rising on the third day is not inconsistent with the tradition of the Church.*

In like manner we read in x. 10 of "the offering of the body of Jesus Christ" and in x. 20 of "the way of his flesh." Both phrases describe His earthly, visible passion. Neither would be natural to this author when speaking of Christ ascended. Nor is there a word in the epistle about His resurrection in the body, on the third day. All is foreshortened, so to speak. At the moment of dying on the cross the Lord enters as High Priest into the heavenly sanctuary.

He enters as being then, and not till then, "made perfect." Helped as we have been by Dr Murray to clear the mind from servility to figures of speech, we shall not suspect that the author imagined the ascended Lord as lacking any of that complete manhood which is guarded by the doctrine of the resurrection of His body. And therefore, as we said above, this peculiar presentation of the Lord's victory over death guarantees a no less complete significance for the "spirits" of just men made perfect.

Whatever may be thought about the date of the three synoptic Gospels, S. Paul shews that the resurrection on the third day was included in the earliest tradition of the Church. Our epistle is the only book of the New Testament which could be quoted to suggest that this tradition was not held by the whole Church. And it is far more natural to suppose

that the silence of our author is due to the special direction he wished to give to his argument. His analogy of the high-priesthood leads him to lay stress on the "indissoluble life," and on our Lord's entering the sanctuary of the presence of God at the moment of His death. According to his sacramental view of things, the inward and outward offering of sacrifice are necessarily simultaneous. They are in fact one; for the sacramental idea is not an idea of succession in two worlds, but of time and eternity, heaven and earth, being "inveterately convolved."

And he was quite at liberty to lay the stress thus. For there is no contradiction of the general tradition. The "ascension" was but the last of our Lord's appearances after His death; S. Paul, who claimed to have seen Him also, would deny that it was the last. The resting of His body in the tomb till the third day may imply that, for our Lord himself, there were, as Dr Murray puts it, "stages" of resurrection. But the immediate "bringing again of the great shepherd from the dead" (xiii. 20) was itself "resurrection." And yet we may perhaps find in this author's liberty some encouragement to hope that those who, like him, nourish faith more readily by meditation on the invisible indissoluble life than by appeal to the visible historical evidences for the resurrection, are not condemned by the apostolic discipline. Only it must also be remembered that these perhaps more philosophic thinkers have to a great extent been secured in their liberty by the troublesome controversial labour of the historians, as our author and his friends were secured by the simpler faith of the Church around them.

§ 27. *The communion of saints is presupposed in this epistle: but the readers are not yet in full enjoyment of that communion.*

One further question must be answered before leaving this part of the subject: what does this epistle teach about the communion of saints, the intercourse between those who are still in their earthly pilgrimage and those who have entered into rest? That most comfortable doctrine is established more firmly by S. Paul, with his assurance that all the faithful live

one united life "in Christ"; and by S. John in all that pervading faith of his in the life eternal which is summed up in the words he records of the Lord to Martha (John xi. 23 ff.), to whom, when she had expressed belief in resurrection "at the last day," He answered, "I am the resurrection and the life." In Heb. xii. 22, "Ye are come unto mount Zion, etc." falls a little short of that. And, as in other places, the reason is that, until the readers make their venture of faith, they have but come near, they have not entered by the living way, x. 19 ff. And in xii. 1 the "encompassing cloud" is a cloud of "witnesses," not of fellow saints in full communion. Yet it is implied in xi. 40 that these witnesses are waiting in eager expectation of that full communion. It might be said that the epistle takes throughout for granted that belief in and enjoyment of the communion of saints which was already part of the fuller faith of Judaism, cf. Isa. liii. 10, 2 Macc. xv. 14, and that it holds out to its readers, as part of the great peace now to be grasped by them, the perfect enjoyment of such communion as was the acknowledged heritage of the Christian Church.

§ 28. *Hebrews and the Old Testament: quotations are reasonably developed from the original sense.*

This thought however brings us to the last division of our enquiry. What is the relation of this epistle to the Old Testament in general, and to that Alexandrine complement of the Palestinian canon in particular which touches on so many sides the Alexandrine or Philonic philosophy?

Few characteristics of the apostolic writers are more striking than the respect they had for the authority of the Jewish Bible. They appeal to it continually. They quote it continually, almost learnedly; yet not quite with the fashionable learning of their day. They appreciate the deeper meaning of its words, its inspiration in fact. But they take a reverent view of inspiration and abstain far more than was usual with their contemporaries in Judaism, and their successors in the Christian Church, from forced interpretations, and unnatural Messianic applications. No doubt this was due to our Lord's influence who appears at the beginning

of S. Luke's Gospel as a studious, but still more as a thoughtful boy, and who always reached so surely to the heart of all the Old Testament passages He dealt with in His ministry. Yet there are exceptions to this sobriety in the New Testament, and, as might be expected in an author of finer education, the writer to the Hebrews is distinguished by his peculiarly reasonable use of the Old Testament.

This has been denied. It was once said by some one that, having opened his epistle with a magnificent assertion of our Lord's divinity, the author goes on to prove it by applying a number of passages from the Old Testament to Him, none of which were meant of Him at all. But that is just what he does not do. He does not attempt to prove our Lord's divinity in this place; he leaves proof to spring by degrees from the analogy which fills the epistle. What he uses the Old Testament for here is to shew that He who came forth from God inherited the name of "Son" from those who of old, in the actual history of Israel, were entitled "Christ" or the "anointed of the Lord." And a like reverence for the original significance of the ancient words in their historical environment runs through the epistle. The quotation from Ps. viii. in Heb. ii. would have no point if the original reference to "mankind" were not recognised. The "to-day" in the quotation from Ps. xcv. in Heb. iii., iv. gains its force from having been a summons in "David's" time to enter into the rest of God which was a repetition of an earlier opportunity. And throughout the epistle the real history of Israel is the main type, or the vehicle of the prophetic Spirit which revealed the ever-growing manifestation of the Christ through the Christ-bearing nation¹.

§ 29. *In Hebrews the Holy Spirit is chiefly thought of as the inspirer of scripture:*

This prophetic Spirit is noticeable. The Spirit of God, as a mighty all but personal influence, is prominent in the Old Testament. It becomes, as revelation proceeds, the Spirit of

¹ See Hort's note on 1 Pet. i. 11 in his Commentary, *The First Epistle of St Peter* i. 1—ii. 17, the *Greek Text with Introductory Lecture, Commentary, and Additional Notes*, Macmillan, 1898.

Messiah. And on this line of developing faith "the Spirit of Jesus" (Acts xvi. 7), and "the Holy Spirit" as one of a Trinity of divine Persons (2 Cor. xiii. 14), attracted the reverence of the early Church. In Hebrews that line is not followed out. The Spirit as the giver of the new life is not distinctly endowed with personality in this epistle. In that connexion the Greek article is not prefixed. This impersonal manner of expression enables the author to fill his phrase in ix. 14, "through eternal Spirit," with a pregnancy of thought which may perhaps be better appreciated in this present day than at any period since the epistle was written. But in the three places where the Holy Spirit is represented as inspiring the sacred books of Israel the article is added, iii. 7, ix. 8, x. 15. To this book-student the most distinctly personal manifestation of the Spirit of God was as the inspirer of the prophetic word¹. And here again the affinity, with no less marked differences, of Hebrews with the Apocalypse (xix. 10), and with that other book which falls into the same group, 1 Peter (i. 11), may be observed.

§ 30. *with whom, as it were, the author converses.*

This manifestation is indeed "personal" in the most popular sense of the term. In one word it might be said that this writer reads the sacred books as though he were "conversing" with their ultimate author, the Holy Spirit of God. That is what he defends in the paragraph, iv. 12 f., in which he says the word of God is living and penetrates the conscience. The "word of God" here is doubtless wider than the written word. But it is wider because even the written word is wider than itself. There is for him no such thing as a merely written word. The word has been written. It was written at various times, by several men, whose circumstances contributed to the producing of their particular expressions of the mind of God. He is too good a Platonist, or sacramentalist, to slight these limitations which are the means of access to the inner

¹ See on this subject Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*. Macmillan.

life. But the inner life, the living One who speaks by these means, is the object of his affection; and since He still speaks in the new events of history and later movement of men's hearts and intellects, all these must be included in "the word" which still interprets itself to the believer in its ever-deepening and penetrating life. Hence the author's bold selection, as of Ps. civ. 4 to shew the angels are wind and fire, though in other places they are otherwise figured in the Old Testament; or correction, as in xi. 27, where he denies that Moses "feared," in harmony with Moses' character as described by the whole story, but in contradiction to the particular verse referred to. Hence above all, that deepening and refining of "the lesson of the beginning of the Christ" (vi. 1) which does discover wonderful germs of the gospel consummation in the Messianic origins of the oracles of God (v. 12), notably in the Old Testament treatment of the mystery of Melchizedek.

§ 31. *This treatment of O.T. has likeness to Philo, but is really different from his "allegories."*

But in this last instance it may be said we have overshot the mark. If S. Paul was rabbinic in some of his old-fashioned arguments, this author is Philonic in his subtleties about Melchizedek. This objection has been noticed above in § 10, and need not be more closely examined here. It may however be remarked that nothing would better serve to illustrate the likeness and unlikeness of our author to Philo than a perusal of the whole passage about Melchizedek in Philo, *Legum Allegoria* iii. 79 ff., pp. 102 ff. The likeness is not altogether superficial, for Philo had a beautiful mind, and to the author of Hebrews the Philonic philosophy was a real preparation for the Gospel. But Philo is diffuse and fanciful. The very title of his commentary on the Law—"Allegories"—indicates the gulf between him and the epistle. Philo wanders far and wide in allegory; he employs facts as arbitrary symbols to illustrate his own ideas. The author of this epistle is led sacramentally through the historical facts of Israel's past and the earthly life of Jesus

Christ to firm eternal truths which can be tested by faith (Heb. xi. 1)¹.

Philo was born about B.C. 20, studied and taught at Alexandria, was versed in Greek literature, and spent a great part of his life in harmonising Greek philosophy, as he understood it, with the Jewish faith. The fruits of this effort are preserved in his chief work, the long allegorising commentary on the Law of Moses. The date of his death is not known.

Following Dr Caird, we may briefly say that the three main points in Philo's philosophy are these:

(1) God is absolute being and as such cannot be known or reached; He can only be described by negatives. Philo "carries back the finite to the infinite, but cannot think of the infinite as manifested in the finite."

(2) Yet in some way God must reach man and man God. Hence there must be mediation. Philo finds mediation in the Word of God; which in the Old Testament meant God's uttered command, His direct action, but had already been taken by the Stoics to express "the rational principle immanent in man and in the universe." And to describe this mediating Word Philo employs a wealth of analogies and figures. His Word seems at times to be almost a person. It is really the principle of all the activities that are involved in the connexion of man with God.

(3) Man is a soul defiled by a body. He is indeed dwelt in by the Word and can return to God. But to do so he must escape from all that is himself. He must escape by losing his will in the divine will; not realise true manhood by losing and finding his will in the divine will.

And yet the distinction in (3) and indeed in (1) is subtle.

¹ For Philo's life and works the reader may be referred to the article "Philo" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible, Extra Volume*, by James Drummond, to Dr Bigg's Bampton Lectures, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, new edition, Clarendon Press, 1915, to the two lectures on "The transition from Stoicism to Neoplatonism" and "The philosophy and theology of Philo," in Dr E. Caird's Gifford Lectures, *The Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers*, Maclehose, 1904, and to Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1908.

We must not be unfair to Philo. He aims at the true conceptions, but he does not get them so distinctly as our Lord taught his apostles.

It is, at any rate, evident that there is a certain amount of correspondence in these ideas with the thoughts of our epistle, though the epistle would seem to correct Philo at least as much as it takes from him. In language there is the same kind of cautious or doubtful correspondence. From many pages of Philo a few characteristic words used in Hebrews may be gleaned, and these mount up to a considerable sum as the process is continued. It is in Philo's abundant imagery of the Word that coincidences, culled and brought together, are most striking. The Logos, writes Dr Bigg, is the Impress of the mind of God, His Son, the Archetypal Seal, the Great Pattern according to which all is made. He is the Divider, in so far as he differentiates, and makes each thing what it is. He is the Heavenly Man, the Prophet of the Most High. "For his atoning function Philo found a fitting symbol ready to hand in the High Priest.... The true High Priest is sinless; if he needs to make an offering and utter prayer for himself, it is only because he participates in the guilt of the people whom he represents.... He is Melchisedech, priest of the Most High God, King of Salem, that is of peace, who met Abraham returning from his victory over the four kings, and refreshed him with the mystic Bread and Wine."

Again however we notice that the coincidences are not always agreements. The main point in the representation of Melchizedek is not the same in Hebrews as in Philo. The following words which Philo puts into the mouth of the Logos would be utterly repudiated by the author of the epistle, as false if applied to our Lord, and meaningless in any other connexion: "I stand between the Lord and you, I who am neither uncreated like God nor created like you, but a mean between the two extremes, a hostage to either side." And Dr Bigg rightly observes that in much of his discourse Philo is but translating the hymn of the praise of wisdom, in the Alexandrine Book of Wisdom, into scientific terminology—of that wisdom which is "the brightness of the everlasting

light, the unspotted mirror of the Power of God, the image of His Goodness"; see *Wisd.* vii. 22 ff.

§ 32. *Hebrews is broadly Alexandrine rather than Philonic, sacramental rather than philosophic.*

Here there is a really close parallel with *Heb.* i. 3, and while it is doubtful whether our author had read Philo, we may be pretty certain he had read the Book of Wisdom. It was part of that larger Greek Bible which was used by the Alexandrine Jews, and which included most of what we call the Apocrypha. The Canon was still somewhat vague even in Palestine. In Alexandria it was no doubt vaguer, and we need not curiously enquire what degree of authority was recognised in these additional books. It suffices to remember that this author knew them and that one of them was a favourite of his. That one was 2 Maccabees, largely drawn upon in *Heb.* xi. and continually suggesting turns of language in the epistle.

But 2 Maccabees is not a book of philosophy. There is a tinge of Alexandrine philosophy in it. So there is indeed in very many parts of the LXX version; see for instance *Gen.* i. 2, where the Greek might be rendered "without visible form or order," and notice the influence of this phrase in *Heb.* xi. 1 ff., and frequently in Philo. A thoughtful man who had received an Alexandrine education would not necessarily be a philosopher, but he would have looked through the window of philosophy and have become aware of that view of things which is ignored by the so-called "plain" man, or the man of "common sense," or the "materialist." He would also have acquired a number of more or less philosophical terms with which to express his deeper thoughts more readily.

That was the kind of scholarship possessed by the author of *Hebrews*. He was indeed more of an artist than a philosopher. So far from aiming strenuously at "pure thought" he frankly delighted himself with the expression of thought in visual images. That is part of what we have termed his "sacramental" temperament. And the sacramental temper is in many respects the antithesis of the philosophical. Yet in one important point it coincides with right philosophy. It abhors "dualism." It would extend the scientific fact that

all physical life is one, into the reasonable assurance of faith that all life is one, that the natural is also divine. Professor Burnet¹ speaks of "the fateful doctrine of two worlds," and shews that Plato never made that separation.

But it was that "fateful doctrine" which gave Philo so much trouble. He tried to overcome it by his mediatory Powers. He was hampered by his heritage of language. Much of what he writes about the "intelligible world" etc. is too conventional. He employs terms which the ancient Greeks had invented for their search after "reality," in his different search after the answer to the question, How can God act as a person? But the writer to the Hebrews troubles little about either of those problems. He takes for granted that God does act as a person, and asks (in his picturesque manner), How can we enter into the presence of God? And he accepts the answer of the whole Christian Church: We can do so through our Lord Jesus Christ, who, obedient to God's love for men, died to effect this. But he wrote his epistle because some friends needed further explanation of this answer. The Church in its earliest days had been content with the very simple explanation that our Lord would shortly come as Christ with the kingdom of God, and then His people would go to God with Him. S. Paul said, Yes, and even here and now our life is hid with Him in God through the Spirit. Our author says, Christ is coming now in the crisis of these troubled times. That was a practical not a speculative assurance. He, with the rest of the Church, still expects the "final" coming. But that was for a "morrow" of which there was no need to "take thought" then, "while the summons was going forth, To-day." What mattered then was the faithful following of the "Captain" who was being "brought again into the world."

Nevertheless, as a thoughtful man writing to thoughtful men, he attempts to discover a general principle which will bring harmony into such ideas of extended, successive "comings" and their results. Our Lord, S. Luke records, had already said "The kingdom of God is within you," or "in your midst" (xvii. 21). And, according to the record of

¹ *Greek Philosophy, Thales to Plato*, pp. 90, 345. Macmillan, 1914.

S. John, He had taught much about His continual presence with His disciples. This author says, The kingdom, or the new world, or the coming age, or the promised good things of God, or the inner sanctuary of His presence—call the mystery what you will—has been brought within reach of all when Christ died. These realities are here and now. They, invisible and eternal, are not separated from the visible things of this practical and responsible life of ours on earth. It is through these practical trials, duties, and affections that we deepen and intensify life till it is recognised as what it really is, the life that is life indeed. Thus we go to heaven when we pray, iv. 16. And you now, my friends, will find Jesus, and enter the sabbath rest of God, and know the vital significance of the Church's dogma concerning the Person of Christ and His strength being yours, if you will recognise "the way of His flesh" in the trial before you, and do your hard duty, and pass onward and inward with Him to God.

It is a "new world" not "another world" that Platonists seek, and Christians believe is their own to use. Only—at least so our author would put it—we have it but as we use it, and while the various persons who make up the Church linger, hesitate, or press on, a seeming inconsistency remains. We see Jesus crowned with glory and honour for the suffering of death, but we do not yet see all His disciples so ready to die (ii. 8 f.). We know Him to be exalted and apart from sin (vii. 26, ix. 28), but only one by one, as each makes the one sacrifice in his own sphere of love, do we attain to His security and propagate it in the visible world.

§ 33. *Thus "faith" in this epistle is trust intensified by hope and love. The author expresses the idea with some Platonic sympathy, but mainly rests upon the Church's doctrine of Christ.*

To take that bold step man needs an impulse. That impulse is, according to our author, faith. Lightfoot has given in his commentary on *Galatians*¹ a complete analysis of the meaning of "faith" in the Old Testament, the various New Testament writers, the Alexandrine and rabbinic

¹ Macmillan, original edition, 1865.

schools: see his notes on "The words denoting 'Faith'" and "The faith of Abraham." On that aspect of the subject it must here suffice to say: that in the Old Testament faith is mainly trust in God; that this primary notion persists in all the New Testament writers, but is rendered deeper and more complex by being involved with the leading passion of their particular theology; thus S. Paul's faith is bound up with the "love" of Christ which sprang from his conversion; S. John's with that "knowledge" of God and of His Son, which is reinforced by intellectual meditation, but springs mainly (as in Hosea) from the experience of personal communion.

In Hebrews faith is coloured by an atmosphere of "hope," and appears as a spiritual force impelling men to endure and persevere and strive towards a holiness, a peace and a knowledge not yet realised. Whether it is innate in all men, it did not form part of the author's plan to discuss. He certainly regards it as having been implanted by God in all the men with whom his epistle directly deals, viz. the children of Israel and the Christian Church. He might, if he had chosen to adopt Platonic language, have said that faith was a form of the in-dwelling Word. But he prefers to put it in the opposite way, as though faith were an embracing potency in the sphere of which men live (x. 39). So faith is a bond of union between the ancient Church of Israel and Israel's heir the Christian community (iv. 2). Thus, from the beginning, faith was connected with hope; for the Church of Israel lived on "promises," iv. 1, vi. 12, 15, 17, vii. 6, viii. 6, ix. 15, x. 36, xi. 9, 13, 17, 33, 39. And so, when the great chapter xi. on faith is reached, the author introduces it by one of his terse proverbial sayings, in which he indicates the relation of faith to hope. It is the substance of things hoped for, the test of things not seen. This certainly implies that the things which may rightly be hoped for are already in being, but the stress is on "time" rather than "reality"; faith presses onwards, to the "not yet." Cf. Rom. viii. 24 (a passage which may have helped to shape this verse), "For by hope were we saved: but hope that is seen is not hope: for who hopeth for that which he seeth?"

A practical application of the verse will perhaps help to the understanding of our author's mind. Suppose a nation at war. If all points more and more certainly to victory the period of hope is drawing to a close. Hope has to do with things not yet seen, and flourishes in dark days. But it will flourish in dark days, if faith is there to give it substance, to "uphold" it. Such faith must obviously be faith in God who alone upholds things worthy to be hoped for. And so faith is a test of these as yet unseen but hoped for things. What then may this nation rightly hope for? Victory? No, that is on the knees of God, who designs that which is truly best for each party in the strife. Peace? Yes, but not necessarily outward peace, only the peace of God which makes for His righteousness among men. Apply the test of faith and one by one all temporal greed and private judgements about what is best for the world are stripped away. The patriotic will is not annihilated, but it is transformed into perfect union with the will of God. The test is severe, but the gold from which it purges away the dross is an inalienable possession. A nation which rejoiced in such a purified hope would conquer the world with God, though it lost what seemed its all. And it would enjoy peace in the midst of violence, and fight indomitably while convinced God bade it fight, for it would be free from all fear and all anxiety; "qui fortis est idem est fidens," Cicero, *Tusc.* iii. 14 (quoted by Lightfoot).

There is plainly a good deal of the Pauline "love" in this author's faith also. It was lack of loving loyalty which caused Israel's tragic failure of faith, iii. 16 ff. And the personal note is distinctly heard throughout chapter xi.; Moses endured as seeing "Him," not "it," which was invisible, xi. 27. It is this personal note which forbids our exaggerating the debt of this epistle to the Alexandrine philosophy. That philosophy enlarged the vocabulary of the author. It also served the intellectual interest which was strong in him, and which enabled him to intervene very weightily in the perplexed trial his friends had to face. But that trial was too real to allow him in any intellectual trifling. Alexandria had been refurbishing old-fashioned

instruments of speculation. Philo followed the fashion. His earnestness made him break away again and again from the method he had imposed upon himself. But the method hampered him. There is much tediousness, much confusion in his writings. His main achievement was that "he first gave utterance to both of the two great requirements of the religious consciousness, the need for rising from the finite and relative to the Absolute, and the need of seeing the Absolute as manifested in the finite and relative; although he could find no other reconciliation of these two needs except externally to subordinate the latter to the former" (Caird). The writer to the Hebrews knew something of this "great problem of his time," and of the manner in which educated men were approaching it. This gives his letter a peculiar sympathy which may well have won its first readers and is still appreciated by its more academic readers in these days. But his main interest was in the sufficing truth he had found enshrined in the Christian Church, and in the life of the Lord Jesus Christ, loyalty to whom was the tradition of the Church. That made him simple independent original. So far as he did touch philosophy he went back, unconsciously, from Alexandrine Platonism to Plato himself. But he only touched that kind of philosophy so far as it suited his more concentrated purpose. He was convinced that in Jesus Christ the riddle of the universe was solved as far as needs be. Much more was he convinced that in Him the difficulty of living a noble life was overcome. And out of that conviction he sent this "treatise of encouragement" to some much-loved and sorely-tried friends.

IV

THE STYLE AND TEXT OF THE EPISTLE

§ 1. *Some characteristics of the style of Hebrews.*

THE writers of the N.T. have each their characteristic style. This is very evident in the original Greek, but an attentive reader catches something of it even in the English version. How simple is the Gospel according to S. Mark, what solemnity

and grandeur in S. Matthew: one is a gospel for the cottage, the other for the church. The epistles of S. Paul are quite different. In these a remarkable man seems to be talking to us. He uses naturally the language of an educated gentleman, but he makes it go deep and far; he is straining common language to express profoundly intellectual ideas; he is setting plain words on fire with earnestness. He compels you to attend, and is easier to understand when read aloud. And notice how this attention and understanding is increased if you use the Revised Version. In the Gospel and epistles of S. John we have simplicity again but a different simplicity from S. Mark's. It is the simplicity of one who seems little versed in composition, but has limited himself to a childlike style in which he moves without embarrassment and finds means to convey pure meditative truth. Turn from these books to the Apocalypse, and even in its English rendering you perceive what the ancient Greek bishop meant who said the same John could not have written it, the style is so peculiar. Our English smooths the grammar but disguises little of the rude vigour. Then there is the literary ease of S. Luke in Acts, and in the preface to his Gospel his literary stateliness. The epistle of S. James is something like Acts in its unstudied grace: so, but more homely, is 1 Peter. Hebrews is akin to the preface to the Gospel. If S. Paul talks to us, this author almost makes a speech; and yet not quite, for it is still a letter he is writing; you feel that the friends he addresses are at a distance, are to read him through the post. He is rhetorical but in the best sense; contrast the less agreeable rhetoric of S. Jude and 2 Peter. His arrangement is artistic.

The late Dean of Lincoln, Dr Wickham, says in his edition: It is, in a sense beyond any other epistle in the New Testament, an artistic whole. It is a letter, but at the same time it is an impassioned treatise or piece of oratory, having a single purpose, ardently felt, clearly conceived, never lost to sight. The whole argument is in view from the beginning, whether in the purely argumentative passages, or in those which are in form hortatory; we are constantly meeting phrases which are to be taken up again, and to have their full meaning given to them later on. The plan itself develops. While the figures to some extent change and take

fresh colour, there is growing through all, in trait on trait, the picture which the writer designs to leave before his readers' minds.

He is careful about tenses, the use of the article, the choice of words. Sometimes, as in vi. 6, ix. 11, xi. 29, xii. 28, we may misunderstand him if we do not remember that he employs a more classical Greek than other writers of N.T. One characteristic of his style is worth special notice, for it helps to explain an important characteristic of his theology. He is a picturesque writer and he is a sacramental thinker. He sees what he thinks, and it is through the outward and visible that he reaches the inward and eternal: cf. *Intr.* iii. § 8. Notice the personification in xii. 4 and again in 5, also in 24. Yet in each case what is characteristic is the delicacy of the figure; the phrase just falls short of personification, cf. x. 23 the "confession" wavering; it is the unconscious liveliness of an ever picturing mind. And in the two instances from ch. xii., of voices in Scripture and in the mystery symbolised by "blood," there is something akin to the idea which runs through the epistle of the Spirit of God speaking in books, history and ritual. Pictures are again and again presented to the mind's eye; see the opening verses i. 1—4; and xi. 13—16 the "pilgrim fathers." Sometimes these pictures are, not indistinct, but hard to interpret. They take form, dissolve, and form themselves afresh, as we ponder on their meaning; so iv. 12 f. and xiii. 7 the release of departed "leaders" from the coil of business, or their martyrdom. Mystery of a deeper kind is suggested in such passages as xii. 18 with its undefined participles "that might be touched, etc."; mark the "appearance" immediately afterwards, which comes in as a curious and peculiar word that lets you into the spirit of the whole design. The converse of this appears in sentences where difficult thought is condensed into luminous phrases and made "clear" by being carried into a higher region of imagination. Instances are ii. 14 "him that had the power of death," vi. 5 "powers of the age to come," vii. 16 "...after the power of an indissoluble life," and vii. 25 "seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." Cf. also ix. 14, xi. 1, 3, 27, xii. 27. There is something of the

same nature, though here imagination more nearly approaches metaphor, in x. 20; worth special reference however on account of the "that is to say," which, perhaps always, in this epistle introduces a more profound second thought.

Then there is the imagination of sympathy, as in the pictures of the divine humiliation ii. 8 f., v. 7 ff.; of the unhappy "sinners against their own selves" xii. 3, cf. "without compassion" x. 28; the silly, halting "multitude" xii. 13; the wakeful leaders xiii. 17; and the recollection in v. 1 ff. of good priests the author and his friends have known. In xi. 21 "worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff," which we are apt to feel an otiose addition, is probably a pathetic detail in the description of the aged patriarch. It is generally safe to let the picturesque emerge from our author's language. Consider how the visual image simplifies discussion of "substance," "make perfect," "conscience," and in their context, "according to faith" xi. 13, "mediator" xii. 24; and how it adds to the value of such rememberable phrases as the "cloud of witnesses," "land of promise," "city that hath the foundations."

§ 2. *A.V. and R.V.*

Translations into modern English, such as Weymouth's or *The Twentieth Century New Testament*, are less acceptable for Hebrews than for other parts of N.T. Moffatt's earlier translation in his *Historical New Testament* (T. and T. Clark) does preserve something of the peculiar flavour of this epistle. Yet how thin is his rendering of xi. 1: "Now faith is to be confident of what we hope for, to be convinced of what we do not see." Hardly indeed may A.V. be surpassed in that verse: "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." The half philosophical, half picturesque phraseology of the original is just caught there, and the marginal note on "substance"—"Or, *ground*, or *confidence*"—goes as far as it ought to go in concession to the weaker brethren. The R.V., it must be confessed, attenuates the sense: "Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen," and in the margin for "the assurance" "Or, *the giving substance to*"; for "proving" "Or,

test." Other, but slight, misrenderings in R.V. are vii. 9 "so to say" instead of "one may almost say," x. 33 "partly... partly" instead of "on the one...on the other hand," xiii. 8 where the insertion of "*is*" weakens the proclamation, which in A.V. sounds forth bravely.

In Hebrews A.V. is particularly good, not merely as a piece of English, but as an equivalent of the uncommon Greek style. The advantage of reading in R.V. is not so immediately obvious as in S. Paul's epistles, perhaps even less so when the proper test of reading aloud is applied. Yet to the theologian, however simple, who does not read to delight his ear but to assure his anxious heart, the satisfaction of R.V. is presently discovered. There is first the inestimable advantage of the pure text. At the outset R.V. strikes the note of hope with "at the end of these days" instead of "in these last days"; then of breadth with "when he had made purification of sins" instead of "when he had by himself purged our sins." It does matter whether Christ came as a high priest of good things to come, or, R.V. margin, of good things that have with His death already come, ix. 11; whether we ought to "consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself," or rather "him that hath endured such gainsaying of sinners against themselves," xii. 3.

Nor is the scrupulous attention of R.V. to this perf. part., "that hath endured," pedantry. As in ii. 18 and many another place the author encourages us here by the belief that our Saviour's pains on earth are still in Him a ground of sympathy with us. If all the many corrections of tenses in R.V. are not so evidently practical in their bearing, more and more are found to be so by the student who broods over his book. Or take the article. Is there no theological beauty in "the city which hath the foundations" xi. 10, "the city which is to come" xiii. 14? Or observe the answer of xi. 14 to xi. 9, "a sojourner in the land of promise, as in a land not his own.... For they that say such things make it manifest that they are seeking after a country of their own." In xii. 2 "endured the cross, despising shame," is perhaps wrong; the Greek has the art. with neither noun, and A.V. reproduces the aphorism more forcibly by adding it to both. But in xii. 14 "Follow after

peace with all men, and the sanctification without which no man shall see the Lord," R.V. has faithfully preferred an obscurity, which at least startles the conscience, to the smooth inaccuracy, which so easily passes through the mind as a truism, of A.V.

In that verse "no man" is a right translation. But in iii. 3, x. 12 A.V. speaks of our Lord as "this man" without justification in the Greek. This confuses the important doctrine of the real manhood which the epistle illustrates continually, but never in such crude fashion. It dwells too on His "compassion" or "sympathy," but the word in v. 2 is different, is even more tender than that, and R.V. "bear gently with" is admirable. A.V. however has "can reasonably bear with" in its margin, and the margin deserves attention in both versions—in R.V. it is as valuable as the text; it is very wrong to print either without their marginal notes. If the theology of Hebrews does add anything to the theology of the rest of the N.T., it is more than worth while to render its peculiar theological phraseology with particularity. That is attempted far more thoroughly in R.V. than in A.V. In i. 14 "ministering spirits sent forth to minister" misses the conversion of ritual idealism into practical service which R.V. expresses by "to do service." "To make reconciliation," ii. 17, is Pauline; "to make propitiation" is the priestly term. "Consecrated," vii. 28, confuses two characteristic verbs of the epistle; the margin has "*Gr. perfected*," but R.V. rightly puts this into the text. In x. 23 "faith" for "hope" is a sheer mistake, possibly a printer's error. In xi. 2, 39 "obtained a good report" is quite misleading. R.V. "had witness borne to them" sounds less plain English but indicates the connexion with the other passages where this verb or cognates are used with more or less approach to the idea of "martyrdom." In xii. 2 the dominant note of "make perfect" is again echoed in "perfecter." A.V. "Author and finisher" has the influence of custom upon us. But the echo is important, and "finisher" may even suggest an untrue thought if we connect it with the popular interpretation of 1 Cor. xiii. 13. R.V. "author and perfecter," with the marginal alternative "captain" for "author,"

carries us far deeper into the writer's mind. In xi. 13 A.V. has "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them," a false reading and a wrong translation. How beautiful is R.V. "having seen them and greeted them from afar." This is an example of that vivid picturesqueness which really belongs to the epistle and which, reverently preserved, may impress the writer's earnest purpose upon more generations of readers than the sweetest compensations in another idiom. So in x. 27 "fierceness of fire" R.V. is better than "fiery indignation." It might seem wanton to alter "Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away," viii. 13, into "But that which is becoming old and waxeth aged is nigh unto vanishing away." But the transposition of "old" knits, as in the Greek, this verse to the preceding. The compound phrase "is becoming old" shews that this is no mere proverbial appendage (which might well be introduced by "Now"), but the observation of a particular and startling process already going on before the eyes of the writer and his friends. And the "nigh unto" is one of the solemn notes characteristic of the epistle; cf. vi. 8 "rejected and nigh unto a curse," x. 25 "the day drawing nigh" and—an answering phrase in the harmony—"a bringing in of a better hope, through which we draw nigh unto God" vii. 19. If this epistle really is a challenge, sounding out of an actual crisis when some great perilous change was "nigh," all this correction was worth making. It is however a pity that those who worked so carefully here should have obscured their purpose by rendering the simple participle "ending" or "dying," xi. 22, into "when his end was nigh."

§ 3. *Rythm.*

Perhaps R.V. delights the ear less than A.V. But let us clear our mind of prejudice before we settle that. In one respect R.V. really seems to have the advantage. The author of Hebrews took pains with the rythm of his Greek. Now A.V. is famous for its rythm. But it is the rythm we are generally trained to appreciate—an English adaptation of

the regularity of Latin. Greek rythm is a less obvious movement, with varying ebb and flow. And whereas A.V. preserves the more formal Latin tradition in its grand but slightly varied cadences, R.V. approaches more nearly the freedom of the Greek. No doubt the main care of the Revisers was for exact translation and sometimes for restoring the author's meaning by attention to the order of his words. But the result unconsciously attained is, fairly often, a nearer agreement with the Greek rule that in prose there should be rythm but no metre, and that the rythm should not be too precise.

§ 4. *The text.*

This however is the incontestable merit of R.V.: it is based upon the true ancient Greek text, whereas A.V. represents the later corrupted Byzantine text. When Erasmus first printed the Greek Testament in 1516 he had but few mss. and those of the late kind to work with. The text thus published was copied with very little alteration by his successors until it took permanent form in what is called the *Textus Receptus* or *Received Text*. In the last hundred years or so multitudes of mss. have become known, many of them very ancient; early versions have been studied; and the witness of the Fathers or primitive church writers has been sifted and understood. In 1881 Westcott and Hort, entering upon the labours of scholars who had gone before, and each of whom had done something to establish principles of textual criticism, published a Greek text. This may not be final, but at least it marks an epoch. The mass of mss., and the *Textus Receptus* which goes with the mass, have been demonstrated wrong. The method of grouping mss. and other witnesses has been established. Rules of thumb, such as "go with the majority," "prefer the harder reading" have been superseded. The actual process of transmission has been traced—for the most part clearly. Westcott and Hort's text may be improved in minute particulars, but the type of text it represents approves itself evidently as primitive: the type which *Textus Receptus* represents is plainly late and commonplace.

And this is no academic consideration but a practical matter. The inspiration of the apostolic writers appears in the bold unexpected things they say. The later copyists, making mistakes, then correcting them, aiming at a smooth inoffensive easily understood text for general reading, debased inspiration into commonplace. Take this one instance from 1 Cor. xv. 47, "The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is of heaven." Thus writes S. Paul of the divinely destined transformation of us all. But his sublime faith is utterly removed by the alteration, "The second man is the Lord from heaven." Throughout N.T. and not seldom in Hebrews this kind of alteration has taken place.

Of course the greater number of variations are far less interesting or important. Textual questions will not be often raised in this commentary. But sometimes they have to be considered. It will make those notes more intelligible if something is added here about a few of the textual authorities for Hebrews.

First then, Hebrews is contained in the two great mss. of the fourth century: in B or Codex Vaticanus at Rome, which however breaks off in the middle of ix. 14 and is lost for the conclusion of the epistle: and in **Σ** or Codex Sinaiticus, part of which is at Leipzig, the greater part (it is to be hoped still safe) at Petrograd.

Then there is **π**¹³ written on papyrus which was the material commonly used in the earlier period before vellum codices came into fashion. This is also of the fourth century. It is not complete but contains a large part of the epistle, and as its text is very much like **Σ** and B it is valuable for those chapters in which B fails. **π**¹³ is in the British Museum.

Codex Claromontanus, D, has the Greek with a Latin version in parallel columns. It is of the fifth century, and is now at Paris. In this ms. we have our chief example of the Old Latin version, i.e. the version, probably African, which was read before S. Jerome revising it produced the Latin Vulgate: see above, Intr. II. § 5.

Besides the Old Latin and the Vulgate Latin, the Syriac and Egyptian Versions are of great importance for the text.

And the following Fathers may also be named as of peculiar interest:

Clement of Alexandria cent. ii.—iii.

Euthalius, editor of S. Paul's epistles cent. iv.—v.

Origen of Alexandria cent. iii.

Tertullian of Carthage cent. ii.—iii.

Westcott and Hort's *New Testament in Greek* is published by Macmillan. The smaller edition has a short account at the end of the principles on which the editors have worked, very clear and interesting, the best introduction to the study of textual criticism that could be read. The full argument is set out in the second volume of the larger edition.

The Greek text actually adopted by the Revisers of the English Version (which is mainly but not exactly the same as WH) has been admirably edited with a select *apparatus criticus* by Dr Souter for the Oxford University Press.

Kenyon's *Handbook to the textual criticism of N.T.* is an excellent guide to the whole subject, complete scholarly urbane.

THE EPISTLE

TO THE

HEBREWS

CH. I. 1—4. THE SON ETERNAL.

Gradually and variously, abundantly yet still imperfectly, in the ancient days God revealed His mind to our spiritual ancestors, the Hebrew Fathers of the faith. He entered into the hearts of His prophets and each of them uttered the word He gave. Now at the end of this period to which we belong the same God has spoken to us in One whose eternal unity with Him we are taught to recognise in the name "Son": One whom He appointed from eternity to be the heir of the whole universe of life, through whom also He created those successive ages of time in which life goes on, ascending ever back to Him through whom it first sprang forth from God: One who, like the effulgence of a hidden glory or the engraven form that perfectly expresses an artist's idea, has never ceased to shed the divine light and impress the divine seal upon creation: One too who in the passage through humiliation which He undertook as well as in the new exaltation thus achieved, bore and still bears onward all things to their destined goal, as He was authorised to do by the commandment issuing from the effectual power of God. For this eternal Son entered into the life of men, and like a priest made purification of those sins which had become the characteristic stain of humanity; and so, triumphant, He sat down on the right hand of Majesty divine in sublime state. Thus in bold concrete terms borrowed from holy writ we figure His heavenly reign, while by adding abstract terms of reverence we confess how little language can describe or mind conceive the co-equality of Godhead. Thus then He reigns, having become in the mysterious progress of that earthly career by so much greater than the angels—those spiritual beings whose glory and beauty it might be imagined He would resemble in His journey through creation—as that name of "Son," so homely sounding, which He, the heir of all, inherited by human fashion of inheritance, is more distinguished in real worth than any that belongs to them.

1 **G**OD, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers

1. *God*] though the fourth word in the Greek, is nevertheless the emphatic word which binds the sentence together. And this emphasis is significant. The gospel is the gospel of Jesus Christ, but the purpose of the gospel is to bring men to the Father. So our Lord always taught. He claimed little for Himself: His disciples found in Him the revelation of God, and could not but say "My Lord and my God," attributing deity to Him. The N.T. is the record of that faith growing clearer through the experience of life. But it remains faith directed through Jesus Christ "unto God" (1 Pet. i. 21). That depth of goodness stretches inward ever unfathomable, but, through Jesus Christ, no longer terrible or dark. "Men to-day," says Canon B. K. Cunningham, "are not particularly interested in proofs of the deity of Christ, but they are profoundly concerned to believe in the Christlikeness of God." Cf. Joh. i. 18, xiv. 9, Col. i. 15, and v. 3 below.

by divers portions and in divers manners] Two ringing words in Greek which open the epistle. They are reminiscent of contemporary Greek oratory and of the book of Wisdom. They express what scholarship has brought out so plainly of late, the progressive revelation of O.T. Each prophet contributed his portion, learned in his particular circumstances, e.g. the judgement of God in Amos, His love in Hosea, His holiness in Isaiah, the new covenant in Jeremiah, law and sacrifice in Ezekiel.

It might be questioned whether the prep. "in" (the prophets) does not point to the disproportionate stress which the Alexandrines had laid on the passive disposition of the prophet; God spoke in him as though he were merely the instrument of revelation. The author of this ep. however is apt to give the deepest meaning to his phraseology, whencesoever borrowed; and when he says God spoke in the prophets he is not likely to have intended less than the fullest inspiration of most reasonable heralds. See Intr. III. 29, 30. Indeed this appeal to prophecy at the opening of the ep. sets the key of the whole. Not mechanical law but the inspiration of men is the line along which God's purpose will be found to reach fulfilment in Christ. This is in harmony with the whole N.T. The Christian Church was at one with the more liberal Judaism of the day in its peculiar reverence for the prophetic augmentation of the original Torah. In this our Lord had set the example. Canon Box says:

Nor must it be forgotten that our Lord's attitude towards the old religion of Israel was that of the prophet rather than the priest. The fulfilment of the Law of which He spoke was essentially prophetic in character. He breathed into it fresh life, deepened and extended its moral significance and claim. And above all He took up a position towards it of sovereign freedom. It is in the prophetic Scriptures that He finds the

manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us ² in ¹his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through

¹ Gr. *a Son*.

most adequate expression of His own Messianic consciousness, especially in Isaiah liii. The people instinctively recognised in the new teacher the voice of a prophet. And in fact the whole character of the Christian movement depicted in the New Testament is prophetic. The Day of Pentecost marked the outpouring of the prophetic spirit and gifts. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy¹."

2. *at the end of these days*] This is the ancient text; not "in these last days." It is opposed like "modern" to "old time." At the end of the modern period to which the author belonged the Son entered upon His ministry. The addition of "these" makes the phrase different from anything else in N.T. (cf. 1 Pet. i. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 3; Jude 18), and it indicates the peculiar attitude of the author to the Messianic ideas of the Church. Intr. III. 19.

hath...spoken] Does this refer specially to our Lord's teaching, or more generally to His whole life and work in which God spoke to men? See the last pages of Milman's *Latin Christianity* for an eloquent appeal to the words of Christ as "the primal, indefeasible truths of Christianity," which, however our understanding of them be deepened, "shall not pass away." There is little more in this ep. about His words; the theme is His act of sacrifice. But His words form here a just antithesis to the ancient prophecy, and ii. 3 agrees with that interpretation. Only, the reference there is less to continuous teaching than to the proclamation of "salvation." Such a proclamation is the beginning of the gospel in Mark i. 15.

his Son] Neither this nor the marginal rendering "a Son" reproduces the grandeur of the original. The author sets us for the moment in the sphere of heavenly pre-existence where ordinary ideas of personality are out of place; these will come presently as part of the fruitful limitations of "the days of his flesh." The Greeks, with their frequent omission of the article in the large tragic style, could express just what is wanted here: "Son" stands absolutely, as "God" so often does. Westcott paraphrases "One who is Son."

heir of all things] The noun is rich in associations from O.T., Philo, and the gospel tradition. In O.T. the "inheritance" of Abraham and his descendants in Canaan, and hence in spiritual privileges, is a common theme: Israel too is the "inheritance" or "heritage" of the LORD. The subject of one of Philo's treatises is "Who is the inheritor of divine things?" In the gospel tradition

¹ "How should we teach the Old Testament?" *Guardian*, July 13, 1916.

3 whom also he made the ¹worlds; who being the effulgence of his glory, and ²the very image of his substance, and

¹ Gr. *ages*.

² Or, *the impress of his substance*

our Lord was remembered (or interpreted)¹ as having described Himself as the heir of the vineyard, slain by the husbandmen, and thereby opening the vineyard to other husbandmen: Matt. xxi. 33 ff.; Mark xii. 1 ff.; Luke xx. 9 ff. The particular noun is rare in LXX. In N.T. it is used by S. Paul, elsewhere only in Jas. ii. 5 and those three passages of the Gospels, and this ep. But in this ep. the three words "inherit," "inheritance," "heir," are characteristic: see i. 4, 14, vi. 12, 17, ix. 15, xi. 7, 8, xii. 17. From Noah onwards the chosen people are represented as heirs of God's blessing in the future. The Christian people have inherited their hope and are entering, heirs in their own turn, upon its fulfilment. All this heirship springs from Christ's universal and eternal heirship. Through Him all nature was created and to Him it all reverts in holiness historically perfected by the ascending strain of life towards its Lord. The commencement of His visible act of heirship is indicated in vv. 5 ff.: He takes by right of inheritance the ancient names of Christ and Son.

made the worlds] *Aeon* in LXX represents 'olam, "age." In late Hebrew 'olam had the meaning "world," but perhaps not when this ep. was written. "Ages" is a fuller sense and therefore likely to be our author's. It corresponds with "these days," i.e. this period or age, just above; and a like full meaning suits best in xi. 3.

3. *the effulgence of his glory*] Cf. Wisd. vii. 25 f. Whatever may have been the original meaning of the Hebrew *chabod* the context often shews that it expressed the idea of glorious light in O.T., and so it was rendered in LXX; see e.g. Is. lx. 1. This was consonant with the Hebrew mind. "The sky had cleared after some days of south-westerly weather, and morning broke in that rare splendour which persuaded the Hebrew poets that perfect bliss will be perfect light²." We might translate "the reflection of His glory" but "effulgence" suits this context; the Son is the stream of light from the innermost glory.

the very image of his substance] The Greek word for "very image" is not *eikon* as in x. i, but *character*, which might be the impression, but is here used in the more primary sense of the engraved seal itself which expresses the idea in the artist's mind: cf. Cic. *Or.* 8, 9, "deep in his own mind he had a supreme idea of beauty, into which he would gaze steadfastly and govern his artist's hand to reproduce it." Cicero had just written "as an image is expressed," so that the rendering of Erasmus and A.V., "express image," may be approved. But A.V. "person" is an anachronism: *hypostasis* (the

¹ See "The parable of the wicked husbandman," A. Gray, *Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1920.

² Hogarth, *Accidents of an Antiquary's Life*, ch. v.

upholding all things by the word of his power, when he

Greek original) was not used for "person" till the fourth century. See three articles by Dr Strong, Dean of Christ Church¹, for full treatment of this and kindred words. A.V. here follows the Geneva version, and may be compared with Wisd. ii. 23, "God created man for incorruption, and made him an image of his own proper being." But that is not the idea in our author's mind. He treats *hypostasis* throughout the ep. more as a philologist than a philosopher. It means that which, in the deepest sense appropriate to the context, underlies, supports, or as here originates expression, and it is always associated with a genitive; cf. iii. 14, xi. 1, and contrast 2 Cor. ix. 4. Cf. also Coleridge², "*Quod stat subtus*, that which stands beneath, and (as it were) supports the appearance." Milton, who conveys so much from this ep., says in *Paradise Lost*, x. 63 ff.:

So spake the Father, and unfolding bright
Toward the right hand his Glorie, on the Son
Blaz'd forth unclouded Deitie; he full
Resplendent all his Father manifest
Express'd, and thus divinely answered milde.

being...and upholding] or *bearing*. The mode of conjunction emphasises the difficult assertion that throughout the days of His flesh the Son was still revealing Godhead and bearing the universe to its goal. But this is the assertion which the author justifies by his sacramental view of glory in humiliation; cf. Intr. ii. 15, iii. 7. For the pres. part. cf. xi. 17, and Phil. ii. 6 where however the compound form employed means "being originally" rather than "being continually," as here.

by the word of his power] i.e. "by the commanding word (cf. xi. 3) of God's power." The second "his," especially in a balanced piece of rhetoric like this, would surely have the same reference as the first. And this fits the context; the Son reveals or mediates God's power as He does His glory and inmost being. The ancient commentators and translators generally took this "his" to mean "the Son's." Perhaps they were unconsciously influenced by their general view of the passage as a declaration of the essential unity of the Son with the Father. But it is more than that. It starts from the prophets, and joins the high doctrine of the contemporary Church concerning the Godhead of the Son with the old prophetic idea of the Christ, the LORD's anointed, representing God in His people. The theme is not so much the uniqueness of the Son's relation to the Father, as His uniting men with God. This becomes plainer as the ep. proceeds; so far it is partly obscured by the technical terms which are borrowed from Alexandrine Judaism.

¹ "The history of the theological term 'Substance,'" *Journal of Theological Studies*, Jan., Oct. 1901; Oct. 1902.

² *Aids to Reflection*, Intr. Aphorisms, xii n.

had made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand
 4 of the Majesty on high; having become by so much better
 than the angels, as he hath inherited a more excellent

when he had made purification of sins] So, without "by himself" and "our" in the ancient text. Neither emphasis nor limitation is accordant with the terse grandeur of this introduction.

sat down on the right hand] First allusion to Ps. cx. which will supply the guiding thought of the ep., viz. the royal High Priest after the order of Melchizedek. Cf. Mark xiv. 62, which is reminiscent of this psalm and of Dan. vii. 13.

Majesty] Used in the doxologies of Jude (25) and Clem. Rom. xx. 12. In viii. 1 it is joined with "in the heavens"; in this rhetorically finished passage the author substitutes "on high" or "in the heights" in a peculiar sense partly for the alliterative music, partly to give distinction and variety to the style.

4. *hath inherited]* The long Greek perfect tense with its running metre is also chosen partly for musical cadence; cf. vii. 28, xii. 2. But there are no idle graces in the author's style, and the perfect is needed here. The Son has inherited that name and still keeps it. This verb is also a stylistic echo of "heir" in v. 2; yet more than stylistic. Hitherto we have been mainly concerned with the pre-existent state of One who received in time the name of Son, also of Christ, and the dignity of Lord, King and High Priest. But the rest of the ep. is chiefly taken up with tracing His inheritance and achievement of these names and dignities on earth. "Most of what is said of the Son in His pre-existing state is contained in i. 2, 3, though some of the things said there are repeated in other passages. The pre-existing state is alluded to very little, and chiefly because it explains the present condition of exaltation, which was not possible except to a being essentially Son of God....Beyond the assumption of the pre-existence of the Son, the epistle seems nowhere to desert the region of history" (Davidson, pp. 40 and 74). Davidson thinks the appointment as heir in v. 2 refers to the historical exaltation after the death on the cross. Westcott, surely better, says, "There is nothing to determine the 'time' of this divine appointment. It belongs to the eternal order." It is in fact the whole of which our modern notion "evolution" is a part. But with "hath inherited a name" we pass to another special part or line of this whole in history. The next section looks back upon the Christs of Israel's history who have, in O.T., received the name of Son, and regards this as the process of inheritance, by which One, who will later in the ep. be styled Lord and King and High Priest and Christ, inherited His name of Son.

5—14. THE SON'S INHERITANCE. CHRIST-SONS IN HISTORY.

The angels I say; for angels have nothing to do with such a name as "Son." God, who speaks in the writers and personages of our sacred books, did not say, "My son art thou; this day have I begotten thee," to any angel. He said that to one of those kings of Israel who were also called the Christs of the LORD, and who, being themselves faint reflections of the divine effulgence and copies from the divine seal, made history prophetic of the perfect Christ. It was again to the best and greatest of those Christ-kings that God said through Nathan the prophet, "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son." And whenever God brings back again the people whom He had called His firstborn son into the family of nations, after one of those repeated humiliations which make the paradox of their spiritual history, and are prophetic of a far more transcendent glory through humiliation still to come, He says, "And let all the angels of God worship him." The quotation is apt for our argument, since this nation, itself too, bore the title "Christ": through all this varied line of Christship our Christ, who crowns the line, inherits His name of "Son."

And on the other hand while God, speaking in a psalmist about Himself, utters words concerning angels which indicate their dignity in the sacramental order of nature—"Who maketh his angels winds, and his ministers a flame of fire," concerning the Son God indicates His place in a more mysterious line along which manhood and Godhead, history and its fulfilment in the eternal sphere, are inexplicably brought together—"Thy throne is God (or does He even say, O God?) for ever and ever, and the sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of God's kingdom. Thou lovedst righteousness and didst hate iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." And, going deeper still, bringing seen and unseen, time and eternity, into still closer union, He uses the person of a psalmist to address Himself by His own ineffable name; yet utters words which certainly have reference to the Son through whom He made all things, and to whom, the abiding heir of all things, they return through all their change and perishing as His inheritance—"Thou in the beginning, LORD, didst found the earth, and works of thy hands are the heavens. They shall perish, but thou still remainest. And they all as a garment shall grow old, and as a vesture shalt thou roll them up; as a garment shall they be utterly changed. And thou art the same, yea thy years shall not fail."

And finally, concerning the Son and not concerning any angel, God signifies in a mysterious oracle, which a psalmist was inspired to express in human words, that One (whom we well recognise to-day) is to reign with Himself in co-equal majesty till the victory over evil is wholly won—"Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet." Such an awful summons was never given to an angel. The angels serve, they do not reign.

5 name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time,

Thou art my Son,

This day have I begotten thee?

and again,

I will be to him a Father,

And he shall be to me a Son?

6¹ And when he again ²bringeth in the firstborn into ³the

¹ Or, *And again, when he bringeth in*

² Or, *shall have brought in* ³ Gr. *the inhabited earth.*

In the universal temple of creation they are the priestly winds, the holy spirits, ceaselessly sent forth to do God's service for the sake of those who are to inherit salvation in that divine victorious act which lay quite in the future when the doctrine of angels was first made known to man, and still we await its full completion.

5. *the angels*] This takes up "better than the angels" in the last verse, and introduces a formal proof of the Son's superiority to the angels. We are reminded of Col. ii. 18 and i. 16, and wonder whether the author is correcting a tendency of his day to angel worship. But there is no further hint of this in the ep. unless the further parallel with Col. in xiii. 8 f. be thought to support the conjecture. And the positive argument of the section, that the Son has received His name by inheritance through the line of the Christ-nation and its kings, is far more essential to the ep. than the negative argument, that the inheritance has not come through the line of the angels. The main point comes out at last in ii. 16; the Son is truly man and therefore truly mediator between man and God.

Thou art my Son, &c.] From Ps. ii., which is addressed to a king of Israel. Apart from the more transcendent Messianic significance which this psalm would probably have in the Jewish Church of the later centuries B.C., it is justly quoted by the author in its context here for this reason. In O.T. kings of Israel are styled "the LORD's Messiah." In the English Bible "Messiah" is rendered "Anointed," but in the LXX, which was the Bible of the author, the rendering is "the Christ." Hence he quite fairly thinks of our Lord as "inheriting" this title through the Christs of the past. He also thinks of these Christs of the past as being themselves, in their degree, revelations of the one divine Christ (cf. xi. 26). And he is confirmed in this bold idea by finding that even these Christs of the past were called "sons" of God. Intr. iii. 6.

I will be to him, &c.] This appears in a striking manner in Nathan's oracle to David, 2 Sam. vii., from which this quotation is taken. The deep solemnity of that passage was felt of old as much as by this author. That is proved by the allusion to it in Ps. lxxxix. 26 ff.

6. *And when he again bringeth in, &c.*] The meaning of this appears from the quotation which follows, "And let all the angels, &c."

world he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.
And of the angels he saith,

Who maketh his angels ¹winds,
And his ministers a flame of fire:

¹ Or, *spirits*

This nearly corresponds to the LXX of Ps. xcvi. (xcvi.) 7, and exactly to one text of a LXX addition to Deut. xxxii. 43. Each poem celebrates the restoration of the people of Israel, who are in Ps. lxxxix. 51 associated with David in the office of Messiah. It is, therefore, when God brings His people, after their humiliation (of exile, &c.), into the fellowship of the nations again, that He bids all the angels worship this people who are His firstborn son (Jer. xxxi. 9; Hos. xi. 1). In Ps. xcvi. (xcvi.) "angels" of LXX represents the Hebrew *'elohim*. This indicates the answer to an objection that might be raised, viz. that angels are called "sons of God" in Job i. 6, ii. 1, xxxviii. 7. In the author's Bible, the LXX, "angels" is the rendering of *bne 'elohim* in each place. Nor is this a false rendering. *'Elohim* is used in the O.T. in various senses, of false gods 1 Kings xix. 2, of judges &c. Ps. lxxxii. 6, of spiritual beings or angels. This last is the use in the passages of Job, and *bne 'elohim* is the regular Hebrew phrase for the class or company of *'elohim*, as *bne neb'ium* is for the class or professional guild of prophets; sonship in the sense of "descent from" is not implied.

A question still remains about the force of the temporal clause "when he bringeth." Being completed by the present "saith" in the apodosis it should mean "whenever he brings again." And this would suit the repeated humiliations of Israel very well: "The exile of Israel in its deepest sense has lasted from Nebuchadnezzar's burning of Jerusalem to the present day¹." But the imperative "let...worship" might be considered the real apodosis; cf. Apoc. iv. 9 f. Then the reference would be to an event in the future, and it is very possible that the author had also in mind that "second" advent of his Lord (ix. 28) of which he treats in a somewhat unusual manner in this epistle; cf. Intr. iii. 19. "Again" might be taken as in preceding verse, but whenever it is followed by a verb in this ep. it is construed with the verb; iv. 7, v. 12, vi. 6.

7. *And of the angels*] Not "to" but "with regard to." No address to angels follows, but a description of angels from Ps. civ. 4. It matters little whether the Hebrew makes "winds" (one word both in Greek and Hebrew meant "spirit" or "wind") and "fire" predicate as the Greek does, or the other way. The meaning will be really the same. Other pictures of angels might be collected from O.T., but this accords with the ancient and deepest idea of the Hebrews. To them the thunderstorm was in very truth the manifestation of the LORD their God. The thunder was His voice,

¹ Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, p. 159.

8 but of the Son *he saith*,

Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;

And the sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of ¹thy kingdom.

9 Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity;

Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee

With the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

10 And,

Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth,

¹ The two oldest Greek manuscripts read *his*.

the winds and lightnings His angels. So in N.T. the Law, given in the thunder of Sinai, is spoken of as ordained by angels, and the coming of the Son of man is expected sometimes with angels, sometimes with clouds; cf. also John xii. 29. That this implies no derogation from the angels' glory is shewn by the author's language in xii. 23, and the symbolic exaltation of nature and "forces of nature" in the Apocalypse¹. All this however is but hinted here. The main thing is that angels are shewn to stand in another line of life from that along which the Son lifts man to God.

8. *of the Son*] The same preposition must have the same meaning as before. Yet the quotation, from Ps. xlv., is in the form of an address. Such a direct address to the Son as God would hardly accord with N.T. usage: even S. Thomas' words in John xx. 28 are different from the absolute "O God." But, besides that, there is some doubt whether the Greek phrase here is intended to be taken as a vocative. In **SB**, that very strong combination of textual authority, "his kingdom" not "thy kingdom" is read. With "his," the natural (though not quite inevitable) translation of the sentence would be "Thy throne is God...and the sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of his kingdom." It is a further argument for following the strong ms. authority that the author has made another adjustment of his LXX text by writing "the sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of..." instead of "the sceptre of...is the sceptre of uprightness," shifting the predicate as though to imply that wherever righteous rule is found it will be God's rule. One who could make such a thoughtful correction as that might make the other to avoid what he felt to be somewhat crude theology. It would be possible to construe the original Hebrew in this way, and it would make the immediately following "God, even thy God" easier. Most O.T. commentators however think

¹ See further Sanday, *The Life of Christ in recent research*, on "The Symbolism of the Bible," and "A Sermon on Angels."

And the heavens are the works of thy hands:
 They shall perish; but thou continuest: 11
 And they all shall wax old as doth a garment;
 And as a mantle shalt thou roll them up, 12
 As a garment, and they shall be changed:
 But thou art the same,
 And thy years shall not fail.
 But of which of the angels hath he said at any time, 13
 Sit thou on my right hand,
 Till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet?

this unnatural, and all ancient exegesis is against it in the quoted Greek.

But the solution of the problem in *v.* 8 does depend in part upon the interpretation of *vv.* 10—12. These are quoted from Ps. cii. 25 ff. As generally in LXX "Lord" represents the ineffable name. Hort writes in his commentary on 1 Pet. ii. 3, "It would be rash to conclude that he meant to identify Jehovah with Christ. No such identification can be clearly made out in the N.T." It would seem right therefore to say that here again, as in the last quotation, O.T. language is applied to the Son to describe His divine character; He is not Himself addressed as "God" or "LORD." But if so, the whole series of quotations might seem to be in an ascending scale. First, His inheritance of the name Son is illustrated from passages in which that name is given to the anointed kings or to the people of Israel. Then, after a verse in which the "nature-glory" of angels is indicated, a second application of O.T. language is made, assigning to the Son the attributes of a king who is addressed as "God," and finally even the attributes of Him who is the LORD God of Israel are associated with Him.

On the other hand it must be noticed that not all those attributes are presented. These verses from Ps. cii. seem to correspond to the "nature" character of the angels in *v.* 7 and to the Son's work of creation in *v.* 2. The mark of His divinity is here mainly recognised in this, viz. that while created nature changes and passes, He as "very image of the substance" abides unchangeable: cf. xii. 27 f., xiii. 8.

13. *Sit thou on my right hand*] From Ps. cx., which dominates in the ep.; cf. i. 3, v. 6, 10, vi. 20, vii. 11, 15, 17, 21, 24, 28, viii. 1, x. 12 f., xii. 2. In the last two quotations the name "Son" was not expressed. In this verse that thought is quite superseded by the culminating glory of exaltation to co-equality in kingly rule; cf. Mark xii. 37; 1 Cor. xv. 28. This quotation brings us to the personal history of our Lord on earth, the humiliation in which this glory was achieved; that subject will be taken up at ii. 5.

14 Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to do service for the sake of them that shall inherit salvation?

14. *ministering*] This adj. might be translated "liturgic," and with its verb and noun is used of the Levitical service in LXX (not in Leviticus); cf. Rom. xv. 16. The angels minister in the "temple" of God, which is the universe, as often in the Psalter. See especially Ps. xxix. 9 and cf. John xiv. 2; Luke ii. 49. "Ministering angels" are spoken of in Philo and the Talmud.

spirits] Here we must translate "spirits" in spite of *v.* 7. But the Greek reader, certainly the Jewish Greek reader, would feel no difficulty in that. He had not learned, nor found in his Bible, the separation between symbol and reality which confuses us. Thus in Gen. i. 2 the wind on the dark water actually was to him the Spirit of God; cf. Ps. xxxi. 5; Eccl. xii. 7; Luke xxiii. 46; John iii. 8, xx. 22.

sent forth] Pres. part. of continual activity. A part. is similarly used in the Hebrew of the seraphim in Is. vi. So Milton, "Thousands at his bidding speed And post o're Land and Ocean without rest"; cf. Lucr. v. 297 ff., *ardore ministro...tremere ignibus instant, Instant nec loca lux inter quasi rupta relinquit.*

that shall inherit salvation] That are about, or going to; the same verb is used in ii. 5, vi. 5, the world "to come." S. Paul's doctrine of election does not enter into this ep., not even in iv. 3; it is the salvation that is predestined not the number of the saved. All that is read in O.T. of angels is here represented as having reference to the salvation to be fulfilled in the latter days; cf. ix. 28, xi. 40.

Hence "salvation" is to be interpreted from O.T. usage not, as perhaps in some parts of N.T., from the contemporary Greek world. Hort has fine notes on the word in his comm. on 1 Pet., pp. 38 f., 48, 103; see also Sanday and Headlam on Rom. i. 16. The dominant idea is that of victorious rescue, as in Ps. xxxv. (xxxiv.) 3; Is. lix. 16—20; cf. Eph. vi. 17. But "salvation in the fullest sense is but the completion of God's work upon men, the successful end of their probation and education" (Hort); so in this ep. it is associated with "progress" and "perfection," ii. 10, v. 9, vi. 9. "Saviour," frequent in Pastorals and 2 Pet., cf. also Phil. iii. 20, does not occur in this ep.

CH. II. 1—4. THE TRADITION OF SALVATION: GIVE HEED TO IT.

Such being the mysterious origin, office and achievement of Him to whom our allegiance has been rendered, we are bound more exceedingly to give heed to the tradition of life and doctrine on which we (unlike the earlier disciples) mainly depend. More exceedingly: for we are in a time of trial, and we must be vigilant lest by however unexpected a chance the tide of trouble sweep

Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to ² the things that were heard, lest haply we drift away *from them*. For if the word spoken through angels proved ² stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, ³ us away from our loyalty. More exceedingly again: for we run a risk like that of ancient Israel, but of deeper consequence. Their Law was a word spoken through the angels of the storm at Sinai; and in due course it was firmly established, and every refusal to walk in its path or to listen to its meaning, though it delayed complete establishment, received just and due payment of the wage it merited. So costly was the establishment of the Law: and how shall we escape away if by our neglect we hinder—no mere word spoken through angels but—salvation itself? And such a great salvation! A proclamation of victorious mercy, which received its impulse in the speech of Him we adore as Lord, has been handed on unimpaired so far as to us by those who heard the very accents of His voice. So far in its course it has been firmly established: God as well as the disciples witnessing to its truth all the way with signs and wonders as of old; with exquisitely varied acts of power; with breathings of a holy Spirit such as inspired creation and our national history, each duly apportioned according to His ever active will.

1. *Therefore we ought*] This verse introduces the first of those exhortations which are so closely interwoven with the argument of the ep. that the author justly styles it a "word of exhortation" in xiii. 22. So, in an ancient prologue to the Pauline epp. (in an Irish ms. of the Vulgate) Hebrews is described simply thus—"To the Hebrews whom he exhorts like the Thessalonians that in the commandments of God they should most readily endure persecutions."

the things that were heard] The tradition of the Church on which the whole ep. rests. Like the ancient prophets, the author disclaims innovation; cf. xiii. 8 f.

drift away] The Greek passive here implies being carried away by the tide of temptation.

2. *the word spoken through angels*] The Law at Sinai, "ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator" as S. Paul says, Gal. iii. 19; see note on i. 7 above.

proved stedfast] From xii. 19, 25 we see how the author (so imaginatively reading his Bible) felt that a risk was run at Sinai; Israel's fear made the acceptance of God's commandments uncertain. Moses the "mediator" saved them from the peril then, but the "word" did not become really firm till the whole troubled course of the nation's political ambition was ended by the exile. This verse like i. 1 is a curious anticipation of modern O.T. criticism.

if we neglect so great salvation? which having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard; God also bearing witness with

if we neglect] A like risk was before the author's friends, but he had good hope of them; cf. vi. 1—12.

having at the first been spoken] Cf. xi. 29, 36. The Greek phrase has almost a personal ring, like "receiving impulse from." Thus it gives to "was confirmed" something of the idea of confirmation by "development."

The first "speaking" was our Lord's proclamation "The kingdom of God is at hand," then the whole of His teaching during His ministry; xi. 4, xii. 24 are not parallels. That teaching includes such pregnant sayings as Mark viii. 35, x. 45, which are the germ of the apostolic doctrine of salvation by the cross. In this ep. the high-priestly entrance into the heavenly sanctuary is contemplated timelessly or as simultaneous with the act of dying; therefore no reference to the forty days of Acts i. 3 is likely.

the Lord] Here first the author names his Master plainly. The readers would have recognised to whom he was pointing throughout ch. i., but there he set them, as it were, by the throne of God in heaven, and opened a vision of eternal things. That would have lost its mystery if he had introduced a defining title which rose out of the earthly limitations of "the days of" the Saviour's "flesh."

It rose out of those days, yet perhaps not immediately. The title "Lord" is not often found in the synoptic gospels in the full sense which it has in the rest of N.T. In many places S. Luke's "Master" might be substituted for it without apparent loss. In Luke xxiv. 3 "the body of the Lord Jesus" is quite unusual. But all three words ("the Lord Jesus") are omitted by authorities which have peculiar weight in these last chapters of Luke, and the closest parallel to them is in Mark xvi. 19 f., which according to the most ancient evidence are no part of the original book. Bousset in his study of early Christian doctrine, *Kyrios Christos*, shews that this title, *Kyrios* or "Lord," was characteristic of certain religious fellowships in the Graeco-Roman world which may have influenced the Christian Church in the development of faith through worship—*lex orandi, lex credendi*. Such influence would not be alien to the followers of Him who is Himself the truth wherever found (John xiv. 6). But there are passages in the gospels (though hardly in Mark) which at least raise the question whether the impulse had not been given earlier and elsewhere; e.g. Matt. vii. 21 f., xx. 31. And the influence of the LXX with its *Kyrios* (see above on i. 10) must also be taken into account.

by them that heard] S. Paul, who claims immediate revelation so earnestly (see Gal. i. 1, 11 f., 16), would hardly have written this. But, taken by itself, it does not put the author and his friends farther from the "beginning" than S. Paul. They had not listened

them, both by signs and wonders, and by manifold powers, and by ¹gifts of the ²Holy Ghost, according to his own will.

¹ Gr. *distributions*.

² Or, *Holy Spirit*: and so throughout this book.

to the teaching of our Lord himself; that is all that is necessarily implied; cf. Acts i. 21 f.

4. *signs and wonders*] So often in Acts and thrice in Paul; cf. also John iv. 48. A frequent collocation in LXX of Deuteronomy, which was rather a favourite book with our author. The idea has some resemblance to the concluding verses of Mark which may have been written by the presbyter Ariston; see Swete's commentary, pp. ciii—cv; there are also other coincidences in language. Closer attention shews that the resemblance is probably superficial. In particular, Ariston makes much of the outward signs; our author passes from his almost conventionally quoted O.T. words to the deeper things of spiritual life.

gifts] “distributions” R.V. margin. The word is different from S. Paul's (1 Cor. xii. 4) and this is one of the passages where translation suggests Pauline colour which is not really present. The idea however is something like 1 Cor. xii. 11.

the Holy Ghost] Without article in the Greek, as always in this ep. unless the Spirit is connected with O.T. inspiration. The exception in x. 29 is a grammatical necessity. Intr. III. 29.

5—18. JESUS THE MAN: GLORY IN HUMILIATION: PRIESTHOOD THROUGH DEATH.

The Lord speaking, God witnessing, Holy Spirit operating! Yes, for it was not to mere angels that God subjected the spiritual world of which we are speaking, our home long destined and now within our reach. To whom then is it subject? Why, to man. Does not some one somewhere call God to witness to this paradox? “What is a man,” he says, “that thou art mindful of him; mortal man, that thou visitest him? Thou didst humble him indeed, but only a little below angels; with a wreath of glory and honour didst thou deck him. All things didst thou put in subjection under his feet.” Glory in humiliation! Strange but true, for there it stands written, “all things in subjection”; there is no exception at all. Well, as yet at any rate we do not see those “all things” in subjection to man. But we do behold One, who stands visible to memory and faith, a little below angels, humbled—He is Jesus, the man: and but a little below angels indeed—it is for the suffering of death that He wears a wreath of veritable glory and honour, so that He may—thus God of His free favour granted—on behalf of every one of us taste death.

Manhood, suffering, death! Yes, for it was befitting Him, for whose good pleasure “all things” came into being, and through

5 For not unto angels did he subject ¹the world to come,

¹ Gr. *the inhabited earth*.

whose direction "all things" hold their course, after bringing many sons "to glory" in the psalmist's dream, to carry Him who was to lead the way in realising that glorious victory of theirs, through sufferings to His purposed goal. For suffering is the faculty of mortal man, and in suffering we find the pledge of real communion; not only the sanctifier but those too whom He sanctifies are seen thereby to have the same divine origin. And that is why He is not ashamed to call them brothers. Who so well as He can give full meaning to those often-repeated words of Israel's martyr and Israel's prophet? "I will declare thy name to my brothers, in the midst of the church of our people I will praise thee." And again, "It is I who will be a man of faith in him." And again, "Behold I and the children whom God gave me." Now there we hear the accents of a common piety and kindred. And since kindred as regards these "children" implies physical relationship, He too partook of that just as they do; for the sake of that great purpose already named, viz. through death to bring to nought the potentate of the realm of death, the awful Adversary; and so to give quittance to all the multitude of those who by fear of death throughout the course of natural life were liable to slavery. For I hardly fancy you will say that such physical relationship, such "taking hold of," is likely with regard to angels. No, it is Abraham's human seed He takes hold of. And therefore He was bound in all respects to be made like to these "brothers" of His. For this is the sum of all that purpose indicated by manhood, suffering, human piety and death, namely that He may become, in regular process, pitiful and faithful as a High Priest on the Godward side, to the end that He may continually do priestly work in taking away the sins of the people of God. For, having gone through the tribulation of trial, He has in Himself the lasting experience of suffering, and in that quality is able to come to the rescue of those who, as their turn comes round, enter into trial.

5. *For not unto angels, &c.*] The LXX of Deut. xxxii. 8 says that "when the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance he set the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the angels of God" (Heb. "of the children of Israel"). This might imply that when the world became "the inhabited earth" (R.V. margin), a society of men, it was put under the control of the angels. Thus "the world to come" might mean "the social world which lay in the future at the time of creation." If so the author denies the inference (cf. xi. 27). But it is more likely that he is giving a varied expression of the thought which recurs in vi. 5, xii. 28, xiii. 14; cf. also iii. 5, iv. 9, viii. 13, ix. 10, x. 1, 20, xi. 10, 16. The world or city or good things to come, the kingdom that

whereof we speak. But one hath somewhere testified, 6 saying,

What is man, that thou art mindful of him?

Or the son of man, that thou visitest him?

cannot be shaken, the opened way to God, are the "kingdom of God," promised in O.T., proclaimed at hand by our Lord, brought in some sense by His death, still to be consummated at His "coming" (ix. 28). That passage, ix. 28, shews that the author holds the ancient faith of the Galilean disciples (Acts iii. 21) concerning the final advent. But it is enlarged and deepened in his epistle. A "coming" in the trial of his own day is recognised, x. 25, 37, Intr. III. 19; and the seeming confusion of past, present and future is removed by his Platonic conception of eternity as reality, not length of time, cf. ix. 11 f. To him there was no antithesis between this world and "the world to come," a favourite formula in late Judaism. If, as the coincidence in quoting Ps. viii. suggests, he knew Eph. i. 21 f., he would feel that he could not quite adopt the phrase used there. His "world to come" is more akin to S. Paul's doctrine of the Spirit, and nearer still to S. John's sacramental thought. It is "the higher hidden life which lies at the roots of the visible life," Gardner, *The Ephesian Gospel*, p. 194.

6. *one hath somewhere testified*] A favourite verb in Acts: "to call (God) to witness to the truth of what some one says." Thus the Alexandrine formula "some one somewhere" is used here with precision. In the quotations of this chapter it is no longer God who speaks in the person of the O.T. writer; here it is a man concerning mankind, in 12 f. the man Jesus concerning His relation towards men. Throughout this chapter the point of view is from earthly history.

What is man, &c.] From Ps. viii. The psalmist contemplates the grandeur of creation and feels the littleness of man. But, remembering Gen. i. 26 ff., he appeals to the LORD to confirm his faith in man's high destiny. In the Hebrew he says "Thou hast made him little lower than God." That becomes in LXX "than the angels." The rendering might be justified from the ambiguity of *'elohim* (cf. note on i. 8). But it is not necessary to press this. The real subject of interest in this chapter is not the angels but the humiliation of Jesus as the means of His glory. The omission of "And didst...hands" in the next verse (so R.V. margin) helps to bring out the simplicity of the argument.

the son of man] So far as there is real antithesis in the original Hebrew, this second term for "man" means "ordinary man," "mankind." It may be that the lowly idea of this psalm and of Ezekiel (ii. 1 and *passim*) was combined with the grand idea in Dan. vii. 13 by our Lord when He called Himself "The Son of Man." There is no direct reference to that title in this epistle.

- 7 Thou madest him ¹a little lower than the angels;
 Thou crownedst him with glory and honour,
²And didst set him over the works of thy hands:
 8 Thou didst put all things in subjection under his feet.
 For in that he subjected all things unto him, he left
 nothing that is not subject to him. But now we see not
 9 yet all things subjected to him. But we behold him who
 hath been made ¹a little lower than the angels, *even*

¹ Or, *for a little while lower*

² Many authorities omit *And didst...hands.*

8. *in that he subjected, &c.*] Is there reminiscence of 1 Cor. xv. 25—28 in the language here? That passage shews at any rate how naturally association of ideas would lead the author from Ps. cx. (i. 13) to Ps. viii.

9. *him who hath been made, &c.*] Throughout v. 8 "him" means "man" in general, in whom the psalmist's faith is not yet seen fulfilled. In the one man, Jesus—note the name of His manhood, here first introduced, so frequent in the rest of the epistle—we do behold it. As He passes to His death, we behold Him glorified in humiliation: see John xiii. 31.

a little] in the ps. appears to mean "only a little," here "at least a little," or possibly "for a little while." The distinction is not important, nor is the comparison with angels. The stress is on "made lower." The author keeps to the main idea of his quotation, "glory in humiliation," but gives a deft turn to this particular phrase.

crowned] is closely connected in the Greek with "made lower." The picture is of one who stands ever before our view (note pres. indic. and perf. part.) as both humiliated and glorified. This compound phrase is divided into two parts by the emphatic "Jesus," and "because of the suffering...crowned" go together. The prep. has its "forward" sense, "crowned for the purpose of," not "in recompense for" death. Thus "that he may taste" follows intelligibly. There is no other way of construing grammatically¹, nor is the grammatical construction difficult unless we suppose a reference to the ascension, as in Phil. ii. 5—11. But in this ep. our Lord becomes king by enthronement not by crowning, and that is in general accordance with ancient custom. Properly

¹ Dr J. O. F. Murray however writes in a letter: "I have in times past taken 'that he should taste death' as referring not to the Cross but to a present activity of the ascended Lord, taking the bitterness out of the cup of death for everyone—as He did in the case of S. Stephen, Acts vii. 55. S. Paul suggests that He is present at every death bed (1 Th. iv. 14) lulling to sleep 'them that are fallen asleep through Jesus.' This would prepare the way for ii. 15, and xii. 4."

Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God he should taste death for every *man*. For it became him, for whom ¹⁰ are all things, and through whom are all things, ¹in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the ²author of their salvation perfect through sufferings. For both ¹¹

¹ Or, *having brought*

² Or, *captain*

indeed this "crown" is not a kingly crown at all but an athlete's wreath, cf. 2 Tim. ii. 5, iv. 8. But the usage of LXX perhaps forbids our pressing that. The title "Christ" which belongs to His exalted perfection is not added to the name of His manhood in this place; it first appears at iii. 6; cf. the antithesis in xiii. 20 f. Throughout this chapter the work of the Lord on earth is in view. Only in the perf. partt. here and in v. 18 are glimpses of that completed glory which will be the theme of later chapters. Intr. II. 15, III. 7.

by the grace of God] A few MSS. have "apart from" (*choris*) instead of "by the grace of" (*chariti*). Textual authority may be considered decisive against this, and it might seem to have arisen from theological reflection, orthodox or docetic; Godhead could not taste death. Comparison with v. 7 f. makes one wonder whether it was not due to recollection of the cry *Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani*, by which the evangelists mark the supreme moment of glory in humiliation.

10. *it became him*] So of Christ befitting us vii. 26, cf. Matt. iii. 15. Philo uses the word boldly, as here, of God the Father. Cf. "it behoved," v. 17.

for whom...through whom] Cf. Rom. xi. 36; 1 Cor. viii. 6.

many sons] Not merely the Christ-sons of O.T. as in ch. i., but all men as in Ps. viii. That follows from the obvious reference in the aorist part. "having brought" (R.V. margin). Rutherford, in his *First Greek Syntax*, says: "The use of the aorist participle to denote an action anterior to that of the principal verb is a sense acquired by it, and cannot be explained as other than a convention sanctioned by its utility. Still there are no exceptions of any sort to this convention, such exceptions as are commonly recorded being no exceptions." Here at any rate there is no need to dispute that *dictum*; this part. refers back to "Thou crownedst him with glory": "having brought to glory as we have just heard."

author] margin "captain." Cf. xii. 2; Acts iii. 15; in the earlier classical Greek of a prince; in LXX and later Greek of a leader or author. Aristotle calls Thales "leader in this kind of philosophy."

to make...perfect] The phrase "to fill or make perfect the hands" is used in LXX of appointing a priest in Ex., Lev., Num., e.g.

he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them
 12 brethren, saying,

I will declare thy name unto my brethren,

In the midst of the ¹congregation will I sing thy praise.
 13 And again, I will put my trust in him. And again,
 Behold, I and the children which God hath given me.

¹ Or, *church*

Lev. iv. 5, where the Greek may be literally translated "The Christ-priest with hands made perfect." The ritual association may have suggested its use in N.T. where it is characteristic of John as well as of Hebrews. But the author's habit of pressing the root-significance of words best explains the varied force he gives it. In each context "bringing to the destined perfection" is the idea. So in Jas. i. 25 "perfect law" is "a law that involves its own end," the converse of what this ep. says of the Levitical law. Philo, *migr. Abr.* i. 457, has the same idea.

11. *he that sanctifieth*] Another Levitical word. The refrain of the "Law of Holiness" (Lev. xvii.—xxvi.), "Be ye holy for I the LORD your God am holy," shews how deeply moral feeling entered into Israel's ritual. Jesus, whose forerunners speak in the next series of quotations, is "he that sanctifieth": "they that are sanctified" are the "many sons," i.e. mankind, cf. John i. 9. The tense of the partt. serves this large faith; contrast x. 10, xii. 14, and note the emphatic "all": Intr. III. 18.

of one] completes "for whom...through whom," cf. Luke iii. 38. But Bruce, borrowing the phrase though not the judgement of Davidson, suggests "of one piece, one whole." But cf. also the Greek gnome, "one race of God and men," Pind. *Nem.* vi. and Adam's development of the thought¹. Add Acts xvii. 28; 2 Pet. i. 4.

he is not ashamed] Of God in xi. 16. Here the condescension, or cheerful humility of Jesus the Son is declared by putting into His mouth three verses of O.T. in which representative personages call those whom they save by suffering (Ps. xxii. 22), or train as disciples (Is. viii. 17 f.), "brothers" and "children," and confess themselves to be like them dependent upon God.

13. *I will put my trust*] An emphatic periphrasis in the Greek ("I will be one whose trust is settled"). The striking phrase perhaps led to the choice of the quotation.

Behold, I, &c.] Cf. Odes of Solomon xxxi. "He lifted up His voice to the Most High, and offered to Him the sons that were with Him²."

¹ "The doctrine of the divine origin of the soul from Pindar to Plato," *Cambridge Praelections*.

² Rendel Harris, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, p. 129.

Since then the children are sharers in ¹flesh and blood, ¹⁴ he also himself in like manner partook of the same; that through death he ²might bring to nought him that ³had the power of death, that is, the devil; and ²might ¹⁵

¹ Gr. *blood and flesh*.

² Or, *may*

³ Or, *hath*

14. *flesh and blood*] The physical constitution of man, as in Matt. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16; Eph. vi. 12; John i. 13. So in Philo and Sirach xiv. 18. Not however in the Hebrew Bible where "blood," as in all other places in this ep., signifies "life"; see Lev. xvii. 11 and Intr. iii. 12, 13. The order of the words in Greek "blood and flesh" is noted in R.V. margin. That order suited the author's rythm. Intr. iv. 3.

him that had the power of death] The English versions might remind us of Luke xii. 5, but the "power" or "authority" there is God's; here the devil has "the empire" of death. There is something vague and shadowy about the phrase. The author, who nowhere else mentions the devil or evil spirits, would be in sympathy with Dr Swete's view of "the personal or quasi-personal 'Satan¹,'" and with Jas. iv. 7, "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." Our Lord died, he says, to "do away with" this lord of death; death itself, says S. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 26 (that passage seems to be still in the author's mind). He holds firm to our Lord's victory over the realm of evil, but does not define the persons of its agents. Nor does our Lord in the synoptic gospels; He condescends to the popular language of the time, but with a quiet correction of its grossness, which impresses the mind of the reader more and more. In those gospels the devil or Satan is mentioned comparatively seldom, with reticent and perhaps symbolical solemnity²; it is the many evil spirits that are oftener spoken of. In the Pauline epp. of the captivity these spirits take on a certain grandeur, so that it is not always easy to decide whether powers of good or evil are meant; see Eph. ii. 2, iii. 10, vi. 12; Col. i. 13, 16, ii. 10, 15. In S. John's Gospel and 1 Ep. they almost disappear, but "the devil" is freely and frankly introduced.

In LXX *diabolos*, "devil," is the rendering of *satan* = adversary, and is used of a human adversary Ps. cix. (cviii.) 6, and of that angel whose office it is to try the servants of God, Job i. and ii.; Zech. iii. 1 ff. Except possibly in 1 Chr. xxi. 1 this angel is not a rebel or an evil one; and in 1 Chr. xxi. 1 the LXX translator, prefixing no article, seems to have understood a human adversary to be meant. Wisd. ii. 24 gives the first hint of the later explanation of the serpent in Gen. iii. as being the devil. Rabbinical Judaism was inclined to the ancient simplicity. "Satan and the evil

¹ *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 370.

² See Sanday, *The Life of Christ in recent research*, pp. 28 ff.

deliver all them who through fear of death were all their
 16 lifetime subject to bondage. For verily not of angels doth
 he take hold, but he taketh hold of the seed of Abraham.
 17 Wherefore it behoved him in all things to be made like
 unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faith-

impulse and the angel of death are one," said Simon ben Laqish (c. 260 A.D.)¹.

The marginal rendering (of the ambiguous Greek) "hath" is perhaps better than "had." Our Lord has reduced the empire of the devil to a shadowy impotence, but as often as we cease to be "partakers of the Christ" (iii. 14) we rebuild its reality for ourselves: in that sense the devil still "hath" power.

15. *deliver*] The Greek verb is found only in Luke xii. 58, Acts xix. 12 elsewhere in N.T., nor there in this sense or construction. With the thought of this clause cf. Rom. viii. 20 f. But this "give quittance" is a less noble word than "set free" which S. Paul uses there. Neither that word nor the Pauline "reconciliation of man with God" comes into this epistle; A.V. is inaccurate in v. 17 below.

all them who through fear, &c.] Such a state is well illustrated by the hymn of Hezekiah in Is. xxxviii., and by all that pagan doctrine of *Sheol* which long hindered true religion in Israel. But the author shews abundantly in ch. xi. that he does not consider that to have been the real faith of O.T. saints. True faith, though still expectant not fulfilled, could always rise above the imperfections of its environment: see below on v. 1 f. That holds good of the ancient pagan world as well as of Israel, but this ep. is mainly concerned with Israel.

16. *taketh hold of*] The Old Latin *adsumpsit* or *suscepit* represents the interpretation of the Fathers "who understand the phrase of the fact of the Incarnation"—"when He took upon Him man"; Westcott prefers the unclassical meaning "help," understanding it "of the purpose of the Incarnation"—"to deliver man." Is. xli. 8 f. seems to have been in the author's mind. But he substituted another form of the compound verb for that in the LXX, which does mean "helped"; cf. Luke i. 54. The picturesque expression is quite in his manner; it is faithfully translated by vg. *apprehendit*; it has a broader significance than either of the other translations allows; and the ironical phrase which is too roughly rendered "verily" (a literary nicety not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible) serves partly as an apology for its rather rude vigour. "The seed of Abraham" instead of "men" was suggested by the passage of Isaiah, but is in harmony with the whole ep., cf. Matt. i. 2.

¹ See Box, *Ezra-Apocalypse*, p. xli.

ful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. ¹For ²in that he is himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.

¹ Or, *For having been himself tempted in that wherein he hath suffered*

² Or, *wherein*

17. *high priest*] The figurative title, derived from Ps. cx. which rules throughout the ep. Here first pronounced, it has been prepared for, more or less subtly, in i. 3, 13, 14, ii. 9—11; indeed almost every word of this chapter has been pregnant with an expectation which is now explained. The psalm has "priest." This author often, not always, prefers the full-sounding "high priest." In the Greek of his time the words were used indifferently.

in things pertaining to God] This has been well translated "on the Godward side." The same phrase is used in LXX of Ex. iv. 16 where the LORD tells Moses that Aaron shall be a mouth to him: "and thou shalt be to him on the Godward side." Intr. III. 5, 9.

to make propitiation for] Elsewhere in N.T. only Luke xviii. 13; see R.V. marg. Kindred Greek words are used in viii. 12, ix. 5; Rom. iii. 25; 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10. In LXX a compound form is more frequent, and often represents Hebrew *kipper*, e.g. Lev. xvii. 11. Both Heb. and Gk. verb can take acc. of person in sense of "conciliate," e.g. Gen. xxxii. 20 (Jacob and Esau). But in the Hebrew scriptures this construction is never applied to God; God reconciles man to himself, man does not appease or propitiate God in the true theology of Israel. Intr. III. 11.

the people] The doctrine of priesthood in this ep. starts from the analogy of the Levitical priesthood though its reality is found in another line. This is one of the terms of the analogy; the word employed denotes especially the people of Israel, see antithesis in Luke ii. 32.

18. *being tempted...that are tempted*] In N.T. "temptation" has an intense meaning which springs from the great trial that shall precede the coming of the kingdom of God, cf. Apoc. iii. 10. In the Lord's Prayer, "Lead us not into temptation" is tinged with that thought, cf. Luke xxii. 40, 46. The first readers of this ep. were entering upon a trial of just that nature. The Lord was "coming"; loyalty involved a hard choice, which might mean martyrdom; Intr. III. 19. For the significance of the present tenses in this verse see Intr. III. 18 and 21.

CH. III. 1—6. JESUS IS CHRIST, THE SON.

That is what the humiliation of the Lord Jesus really means. Wherefore, ye brothers in a consecrated life, partakers like Him in a summons to heavenly exaltation through the trials of earth,

3 Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly
calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our
2 confession, *even* Jesus; who was faithful to him that

penetrate into the heart of Him whom God sent on such a mission and made High Priest of the creed which you are destined to confess courageously. We name Him Jesus, man among men, faithful with manly faithfulness to God who appointed Him His task. So, Scripture says, was Moses faithful in God's family. But His faithfulness has richer consequences. For He stands before us endued with a glory more abundant than Moses had, the glory of kinship with the founder of the family himself. I mean God, and I mean a larger family than Moses knew as God's; Israel was God's family indeed, but God's true family is everywhere. And further, if it was in that universal family that Moses served, still he was but the servant; when God called him faithful, that was but a guarantee that he would faithfully make known to the people what God purposed to tell him; while God's Christ (even the Christ-kings of Israel's monarchy) was to be styled "Son," and the son, as founder's kin, is in authority over the family. That family, ruled by the supreme Christ, are we, if we resolve to hold fast the boldness and the boast of the hope with which such a divine pedigree invests us.

1. *holy brethren, partakers*] take up thoughts already thrown out in i. 9, ii. 11 f., 17. So too "consider" answers to "behold" ii. 9. It is still Jesus, the man, on whom attention is fixed; not till v. 5 are the two lines of ch. i. (the divine Son) and ch. ii. (the fellow-man) brought together in the title Christ. The reading "Christ Jesus" (A.V.) here has no place in any type of ancient text.

the Apostle and High Priest] As effluence of the divine glory, as proclaimer and leader of salvation He was "sent." Cf. Gal. iv. 4, but more especially John xvii. 3. The idea is characteristic of John, Gospel and 1 Ep. In 1 John iv. 10, "sent his Son to be the propitiation," it is combined, as here, with the sacerdotal analogy. In Paul the word "apostle" has generally a more technical ring. Here it has a larger sense as in John xiii. 16: so also in that place in the synoptic gospels where it is used for the first time, Mark iii. 14 (NB and R.V. marg.); Luke vi. 13; contrast Matt. x. 2. Cf. Clem. XLII. "the apostles received the good tidings for us from the Lord Jesus Christ, Jesus the Christ was sent forth from God."

our confession] Twice again in the ep. iv. 14, x. 23; in a more general sense 2 Cor. ix. 13; in 1 Tim. vi. 12 f. of the brave confession of faith which, after the example of Christ, a churchman ready for martyrdom makes. That passage helps us to understand both confession and calling here.

2. The reference in this and the following verses is to Num. xii. where Moses is vindicated by God against the complaint of Miriam

¹appointed him, as also was Moses in all ²his house. For ³he hath been counted worthy of more glory than Moses, by so much as he that ³built the house hath more honour than the house. For every house is ³builded by some ⁴one; but he that ³built all things is God. And Moses ⁵indeed was faithful in all ²his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were afterwards to be spoken; but Christ as a son, over ²his house; whose house ⁶are we, if we hold fast our boldness and the glorying

¹ Gr. *made*.

² That is, *God's house*. See Num. xii. 7.

³ Or, *established*

and Aaron. Moses is no mere prophet to whom God makes himself known in vision and dream; "with him will I speak mouth to mouth": the fut. "will I speak" explains "those things which were afterwards to be spoken" below. But "servant" gets an emphasis in LXX by repetition; Moses is intimate with God, yet still a servant. Cf. Philo, *Leg. All.* III. 128: "God only is faithful, God and any one who is a friend to God, even as Moses is said to have been faithful in all the house." In Wisd. x. 16 Moses is called "servant of the Lord" and Lightfoot says (on Clem. iv.) that in ecclesiastical literature "'the servant of God' was a recognised title of Moses, as 'the friend of God' was of Abraham."

appointed] or as in margin "made," i.e. "made him Apostle and High Priest." This is obvious and natural; "created," absolutely, would—apart from the question of orthodoxy—bring a superfluous thought into the context.

4. *but he that built (or established) all things is God*] Cf. i. 2, God made all things through the Son. This is not a declaration of the divinity of Jesus as creator, but a step in the argument for His divinity as Son.

6. *but Christ as a son*] Another step in the same argument. "Christ" in N.T., but especially in this ep., links the history of Israel with the gospel, the adoption of the people of God with the incarnation of the Son. Here as in v. 5 the title looks backwards and forwards; Moses was not one of those Christs who were of old called "sons," Jesus is the Christ in whom that Sonship is perfected.

whose house are we] The house throughout this passage is a house of persons, a family. Cf. Abbott¹. "These things reveal the object of Jesus as being, from the first, not the establishment of what men would commonly call a Kingdom, but the diffusion of what we should rather call the atmosphere of a Family, a spiritual emanation spreading like a widening circle from a source within Himself as a centre, and passing into the hearts of all that were

¹ *The fourfold Gospel*, section III. *The Proclamation*, pref.

7 of our hope firm unto the end. Wherefore, even as the Holy Ghost saith,

fitted to receive it, so as to give them something of His own power or 'authority'—a term defined in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel as being 'authority to become children of God.'" This quotation helps us also to appreciate the paradox (a favourite one in S. Paul) of Christian boasting: "the glorying" or rather "boast of our hope." In the late text followed by A.V. this paradox is smoothed away.

firm unto the end] omitted in p¹³B. The phrase is unnecessary here and (in the Greek) grammatically awkward. In v. 14 it is otherwise, and it would gain force there by coming freshly.

CHS. III. 7—IV. 2. THEREFORE LISTEN TO THE CALL.

Loyalty and hope is the tradition in God's family. Therefore, as the Holy Spirit saith in Scripture, "To-day if ye shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts as in the Provocation after the manner of the day of the Temptation in the wilderness; in which wilderness your fathers became God-tempters in the time of his assay, 'when,' saith God, 'they saw my works full forty years.'" "Wherefore," He continueth, "I was wroth with that generation and said, 'Ever do they wander in heart, they are the people that know not my ways. As I swore in my anger; certainly they shall not enter into my rest.'" Look to it, brothers, that there be not in any one of you an evil heart of mistrust, manifesting itself in apostasy from God who lives; but encourage one another from day to day while still the call "To-day" is sounding; that no one of you be hardened by the speciousness of that sin which fills our thought at this time. There is ground for encouragement, for partakers in the fellowship of the Christ-nation we long have been, and still shall be, if we will but hold fast the principle of its foundation firmly to the end; the while it is still said, "To-day, if ye shall hear His voice, harden not your hearts as in the Provocation." For who were they that heard and provoked? Why, were they not all those who came out of Egypt, under the leadership of Moses? And with whom was He wroth full forty years? Was it not with those who sinned, whose limbs, saith Scripture, fell in the wilderness? And to whom swore He that they should not enter into His rest, but to those who refused to trust Him? Indeed we plainly see that the reason they could not enter was just that—mistrust. Let us therefore fear, lest while the promise of entering into His rest survives though they perished, any one of your number shall be found (a thing scarce credible) to have deserted your post. Your post, I say, for we too have now heard that same good tidings of rest which they did, though the sense of what they heard was no use to them—those unhappy men whom we still remember as lost from the company of the true hearers who have been welded into one body by faith.

To-day if ye shall hear his voice,
 Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, 8
 Like as in the day of the temptation in the wilderness,
¹Wherewith your fathers tempted *me* by proving *me*, 9
 And saw my works forty years.
 Wherefore I was displeased with this generation, 10
 And said, They do alway err in their heart:
 But they did not know my ways;
 As I swore in my wrath, 11
²They shall not enter into my rest.

Take heed, brethren, lest haply there shall be in any one 12
 of you an evil heart of unbelief, in falling away from the
 living God: but exhort one another day by day, so long 13
 as it is called To-day; lest any one of you be hardened

¹ Or, *Where*

² Gr. *If they shall enter.*

7. *as the Holy Ghost saith*] So x. 15, cf. ix. 8; Intr. III. 29. The quotation is from Ps. xcv. in which the psalmist's invitation to worship passes into warning; then, at "where your fathers tempted" the voice of God himself breaks in. The author follows LXX, though not agreeing exactly with any one known ms., and perhaps adapting at his own will. Thus "wherefore" is probably his own addition. He divides the sentence where the "first person" begins, and so lays emphasis upon the conclusion. This brings the "forty years" into connexion with the "tempting" or "trying," and comparison with Deut. viii. 2 f. suggests that "proving" means the proof to which God put the Israelites (notice the italics in R.V.) during the whole period of their wandering; for the metaphor cf. Sir. vi. 21; 1 Pet. i. 7.

11. *If they shall enter* (R.V. marg.)] A strong negative, as often in LXX (cf. Mark viii. 12). It represents a Hebrew idiom, an aposiopesis frequent in oaths.

12. *an evil heart of unbelief*] The force of "unbelief" or "faithlessness" here may be felt by comparing 2 Tim. ii. 13, "if we are faithless, he abideth faithful." But *pistis*, "faith," with its cognates, gradually reveals its definite significance in this ep. as the argument develops.

in falling away from the living God] Cf. 1 Tim. iv. 1 for the verb, and contrast it for the noun. The phrase "living God," frequent in N.T. and nearly always (in the true text) without article, is used with special emphasis in this ep., cf. ix. 14, x. 31, xii. 22. To readers brought up in Judaism it would imply the essential energy of Godhead, cf. Matt. xvi. 16, xxvi. 63. To Grecized ears the epithet "true" might mean more, cf. 1 Thess. i. 9; 1 John v. 20. In ix. 14 a later text betrays itself by adding "and true."

14 by the deceitfulness of sin: for we are become partakers
 1 of Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence
 15 firm unto the end: while it is said,

To-day if ye shall hear his voice,

Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation.

16 For who, when they heard, did provoke? nay, did not

¹ Or, *with*

13. *by the deceitfulness of sin*] If that is all the author meant there is a slight irregularity in the Greek construction which surprises us in so correct a writer. "By the sin's deceitfulness" might represent this in English, and it may be supposed that he intended to mark thus unusually the definite character of the sin. He means some particular sin to which his friends were immediately liable, cf. xii. 1, 4.

14. *partakers of Christ*] In i. 9 (= Ps. xlv.) this Greek had the same meaning as in Luke v. 7. Here it is used as in iii. 1, vi. 4, xii. 8, *participes Christi*, Lat. Nor is there any difficulty in this if the O.T. idea of "the inclusive Christ" be remembered: "partakers of the Christ" would be a more faithful and intelligible rendering. Intr. III. 18.

the beginning of our confidence] The word *hypostasis* (= substance or foundation) is used here as in xi. 1. As "foundation" it may mean "firmness" of character or resolution. It is so used in 2 Cor. ix. 4, xi. 17, and it is a natural extension of the word into metaphor. But the author's habit is to press the literal sense, and if the idea expressed in the last note be just we may suppose him here to be referring, in quasi-philosophical phrase, to the principle of Christship founded upon which his readers had started upon their spiritual course, cf. vi. 1. The vg. with its *initium substantiae eius* might seem to support this explanation. Westcott quotes Primasius: "The beginning of substance he calls Christ's faith, through which we subsist and have been born again, because it is the foundation of all virtues. And right well does he call it substance, because as body subsists and is vivified by soul, so soul by faith subsists in God and lives by this faith. And faith is called Christ's substance either because it is given by him, or because he certainly does live through faith in the hearts of the faithful." He had xi. 1 in mind, and it may be noticed that one MS gives "faith" here instead of *hypostasis*.

15. *while it is said...provocation*] Either a complete sentence in itself with apodosis at "harden not" (A.V.); or a continuation of the last sentence (R.V.); or it might be printed with a dash after "provocation," the form of the warning being rhetorically altered at "for who...?"

16. *For who...?*] A.V. "For some" was no doubt influenced by vg. *quidam enim*. The Greek pronouns only differ by an accent.

all they that came out of Egypt by Moses? And with 17
whom was he displeased forty years? was it not with them
that sinned, whose ¹carcases fell in the wilderness? And 18
to whom sware he that they should not enter into his
rest, but to them that were disobedient? And we see 19
that they were not able to enter in because of unbelief.

Let us fear therefore, lest haply, a promise being left 4
of entering into his rest, any one of you should seem to
have come short of it. For indeed we have had ²good 2
tidings preached unto us, even as also they: but the word
of hearing did not profit them, because ³they were not

¹ Gr. *limbs*.

² Or, *a gospel*

³ Some ancient authorities read *it was*.

The unaccented "some" does sometimes stand at the beginning of the sentence, but rarely, and here the position would be too emphatic and the series of rhetorical questions would be broken. The idiomatic "but" (R.V. "nay") misled the old Latin translators from whom *quidam* of vg. is derived. For the historical fact see Num. xiv. 28—35 (to which there is verbal allusion in next verse), xxvi. 64; Deut. ii. 14.

IV. 1. *a promise*] This word, which in Acts xxiii. 21 bears the more classical sense of "announcement," is often used by Paul of the promises made to Israel. In LXX it is used of God's promise or announcement in Ps. lv. (lvi.) 9; Amos ix. 6, which latter (half) verse might almost serve as a motto to this ep.: "who buildeth his ascent unto the heaven and foundeth his promise upon the earth."

2. *have had good tidings preached*] By the time the heading to Mark was written *evangelion*, "the Evangel," had come to mean "The Gospel of Jesus Christ." But when our Lord proclaimed "the gospel of the kingdom," or spoke of "losing life for my sake and the gospel," He was, like the author of this ep., carrying on the idea of the "good tidings" already declared to Israel. The use of the verb in Is. xl.—lxvi. especially prepared the way for N.T. See Is. xl. 9, lii. 7 (and Rom. x. 15), lx. 6, lxi. 1 (and Luke iv. 18 f.).

the word of hearing] Cf. 1 Thess. ii. 13; Rom. x. 16 f.; Gal. iii. 2, 5. The Greek phrase here is a little different and almost looks like an improvement upon Paul's vague "Hebraism." It is not "the word heard" but "the sense of what was heard"; cf. LXX of Ez. xii. 23, "the days have arrived and the meaning of every vision."

because they were not united by faith with them that heard] "Because-they-were-united" is one word, a perf. part., in Greek. By the omission of one letter it becomes "because-it-was-not-united," as A.V. reads. Both readings have good ancient attestation.

3 united by faith with them that heard. ¹For we which

¹ Some ancient authorities read *We therefore*.

Since Westcott and Hort and the Revisers formed their texts, their choice has been confirmed by accession of the papyrus p¹³ to the group they followed. This may almost turn the scale, especially if it can be demonstrated that the plural participle best fits the context. It surely does. The author's mind is intensely set upon the peril to his readers' loyalty. He looks back for illustrative warning to Israel's history. He sees the disobedient Israelites standing as it were pictured before him; hence the perfect which well describes those persons but would ill fit the abstract "word of hearing" (cf. ii. 9, vii. 3, xii. 2, 23). But some (spite of v. 16) did listen to that "gospel." Caleb did then (see reff. to Num. and Deut. already given), and the Lord's disciples did afterwards (cf. ii. 3). With that company of faithful listeners the "generation" whom Moses led out of Israel are not (not "were not") "very members incorporated in the mystical body."

CH. IV. 3—10. REST IS OFFERED YOU.

For there is a rest into which we are entering even now, we who have made the venture of faith, according to that He hath said, "As I swear in my wrath, certainly they shall not enter into my rest."...And yet...after the six days' work of creation was finished, He hath said somewhere I think concerning the seventh day words like these, "And God rested on the seventh day from all his works."...And then in this psalm again, "Certainly they shall not enter into my rest."...What do these deep hints and disappointing contradictions mean? Why surely this: since the fulfilment of the promise demands that certain persons should enter, and since those who heard the good tidings in former days did not enter because of their stubbornness, He now again defines a particular day, saying "To-day" in the person of David after all this long time; it is with prophetic significance that the proclamation comes to us, "To-day if ye shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts." It comes to us; for if it had been "rest" that their Jesus gave to them when he led the second generation of the wanderers into Canaan, the Holy Spirit would not be speaking in the later period of the psalmist about another fateful day. There remaineth therefore a divine rest for the people of God. For whoso hath entered into that rest which God offers is witness to a bold analogy. Such a one needs no more to choose and see. He has found rest from the anxieties of effort, even as God, after what we can only imagine as the six days' effort of creation, returned into the tranquil energy of Godhead.

3. *For*] The margin gives "therefore," the reading of an important group of mss. If "them that heard" refers (as is supposed in the last note) to the Christian Church, "for" gives

have believed do enter into that rest; even as he hath said,

As I sware in my wrath,

¹They shall not enter into my rest:

although the works were finished from the foundation of the world. For he hath said somewhere of the seventh *day* ⁴ on this wise, And God rested on the seventh day from all his works; and in this *place* again, 5

¹They shall not enter into my rest.

Seeing therefore it remaineth that some should enter ⁶ thereinto, and they to whom ²the good tidings were before preached failed to enter in because of disobedience, he ⁷ again defineth a certain day, ³saying in David, after so long a time, To-day, as it hath been before said,

To-day if ye shall hear his voice,

Harden not your hearts.

¹ Gr. *If they shall enter.*

² Or, *the gospel was*

³ Or, *To-day, saying in David, after so long a time, as it hath been &c.*

much the best sense. Without p^{13} the authorities would be too strong on either side to allow that consideration to be decisive. Again the accession of p^{13} to the first group turns the scale. In the following phrase it is more than possible that A.V. "rest" is better than R.V. "that rest." The small but strong group which omits the Greek article allows us to recognise a certain subtlety in our author's language; this is not "the rest" of the psalm in its primary sense, but "a rest" which new experience reads into the old words. Intr. iv. 2.

which have believed] Is this technical, "who have become Christians," cf. Rom. xiii. 11? or quite general, the antithesis to "because of unbelief," iii. 19? Or may we compare xiii. 21 and understand that deep conversion which is peace indeed, already enjoyed by the author, who, because he desires it for his friends, writes them this earnest letter?

although] The construction of this sentence is not quite in our author's manner and it yields a rather dim sense. If, with p^{13} only, we might omit "for" before "he hath said," all would be clear. The particle would have the meaning "and yet" or "and further" which it has sometimes in classical Greek and possibly in Acts xiv. 17: see paraphrase above.

7. *in David*] More like "in the prophets," i. 1, than Rom. ix. 25, xi. 2. But the stress is on the Holy Spirit who speaks (iii. 7), not on the tradition of human authorship. "To-day" may be

8 For if ¹Joshua had given them rest, he would not have
 9 spoken afterward of another day. There remaineth there-
 10 fore a sabbath rest for the people of God. For he that is
 entered into his rest hath himself also rested from his
 11 works, as God did from his. Let us therefore give

¹ Gr. *Jesus*.

second accusative after "defineth." Then "saying" would introduce the repeated quotation, and "as it hath been before said" would refer back to iii. 7, 15. That is a legitimate rendering of the Greek, though it is not certain (in spite of R.V.) that this verb is so used elsewhere in N.T. A strong group of authorities read the active instead of passive perfect, and instead of "defineth" the Old Latin renders that verb "defineth beforehand." Reading and rendering seem to point to a deeper significance in this return upon the already repeated quotation. The psalm is now recognised as prophetic of a further future which is pressing to fulfilment while this letter is being written: "again he defines beforehand... saying To-day...even as he has foretold."

8. *For if Joshua*] Cf. xi. 15 f. but the Greek is "Jesus" as in margin and in A.V., and the explanation "Joshua" rather spoils the point. Very likely this name "Jesus," as sometimes "Christ" in this ep., sounds confusing to ears accustomed to the English Bible. But to readers of LXX there would be no doubt about the reference to "Jesus the son of Naue" who brought Israel into Canaan; to converts from Judaism that Jesus would be the old familiar name. The coincidence enriches old and new with interchange of associations; the emphatic position of "them" in the Greek helps to keep the distinction clear; presently, in v. 14, it will be strikingly asserted.

9. *a sabbath rest*] A noun (found also in Plutarch, not in LXX) formed from the Hebrew *sabat*, which is translated "rested" in Gen. ii. 2 quoted above. Wetstein quotes passages from rabbinical writings in which the sabbath is a type of "the age to come which is all sabbath and rest unto life eternal"; cf. Abelard's hymn, "O quanta qualia sunt illa sabbata Quae semper celebrat superna curia." But our author knows a sabbath rest which may be enjoyed here and now; the aorists in v. 10 are neither "gnomic" nor "post futurum"; they spring from experience, cf. xiii. 21.

11—13. BE ZEALOUS AND SINCERE.

Zealous therefore let us be to enter into that rest, in order that no one of us may chance to fall, involved in that same ruin which is the type of all resistance to God's purpose. For the Word of God, wherever heard, is His reason and is alive. Practical it is, and cuts both ways, for comfort and for judgement, more sharply than any two-edged sword; and penetrates to that inmost centre

diligence to enter into that rest, that no man fall¹ after the same example of disobedience. For the word of God¹² is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart. And there is no¹³ creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and laid open before the eyes of him with whom we have to do.

¹ Or, *into* Gr. *in*.

of our being where the immaterial and material elements combine to form a person; and analyses the prudent calculations and the quick intuitions of the heart. No corner of our nature is obscure to Him, but all is naked and exposed before His eyes, to whom the reasonable conscience He himself has planted in us must give answer.

11. *that no man...of disobedience*] Notice the emphatic final genitive, as in *v.* 8 *supra* and *x.* 20. In such a vigorously composed clause it would be rash to deny that the strange expression "fall into a type or example" (see margin) is possible. But it would be strange, and "fall" is weightier if taken absolutely; cf. "fell away," *vi.* 6. The Greek *hypodigm* ("example") is "a sign suggestive of anything" (*viii.* 5, *ix.* 23), and so may signify a crime or horror which is a world's wonder, cf. 2 *Pet.* *ii.* 6.

12. *For the word of God is living, &c.*] This explains the fresh interpretation which has just been put upon the written word of the psalm. But so much in the following paragraph resembles what Philo says of the "logos" in a wider sense, that it is necessary to recognise something of the larger sense here also. The predicate "living" makes this possible. The written word is no mere fixed letter; it is the means of conversation—a "reasonable service"—with the living and still speaking God. *Intr.* *iii.* 30.

sword] Cf. *Luke* *ii.* 35, "Yea and a sword shall pierce through thine own soul; that thoughts out of many hearts may be revealed"; a saying which really illustrates this passage, with its keen analysis of conscience, more vividly than the more intellectual parallels in Philo: see *Intr.* *iii.* 32. But in *Luke* the word for "sword" is a "great sword," elsewhere in N.T. only in *Apoc.* The word used here may have its general N.T. meaning "sword," as in *xi.* 34, 37, or its more proper meaning "knife," and the grim realism of the whole simile may be drawn from fighting, or from the butcher-work of sacrifice, or possibly from surgery. Cf. note on *vi.* 19.

13. *laid open*] The choice between these alternatives might be decided if we could recover the primary meaning of this word, but that is not easy. Philo uses a compound of the same verb

- 14 Having then a great high priest, who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold

(*de praem.* p. 413) of an athlete "thrown" or perhaps "doubled backwards" by superior strength. Theodoret says the metaphor is from victims in sacrifice. Hesychius, the (late) Alexandrine lexicographer, says the meaning is "made manifest." So the Latin and Syriac versions. The general idea may be illustrated by a passage in Dr H. F. Hamilton's book, *The People of God*, vol. 1.: "What causes Isaiah's apprehension is the very vividness of his consciousness, *the nakedness with which he sees his soul contrasted against another Personality*. If death is sometimes apprehended because consciousness is felt to be dying out, in this case death is apprehended because consciousness is passing the bounds of life in the opposite direction. It is becoming so acute and so intense, ... that the prophet feels that soul and body are on the point of being torn asunder."

with whom we have to do] Windisch translates "of whom we speak," comparing Philo and Wisd. vi. 9. Westcott, "to whom we have to give account." The literal translation is "Towards whom for us is the word." Having no equivalent in English to the Greek *logos* with its complex associations we can hardly express the effect, which nevertheless we feel, of its emphatic position at the beginning and end of the sentence.

14—16. THE COMPASSIONATE HIGH PRIEST.

Having then a High Priest who is supreme above all others, and has passed right onward beyond all our imaginations of heaven, Jesus, the Son of God, let us be loyal in our allegiance to One who is so great yet so kind. For we have not such a High Priest as cannot be touched with the passionate trouble of our infirmities. He has gone through every kind of temptation that men are subject to; He has been as liable to fall as other men; but through all He has kept innocence. Trusting therefore in His real victory over sin, let us draw near with boldness to the throne of God's grace, that we may receive the royal boon of God's pity, and find His Fatherly countenance turned graciously upon us, for rescue in each time of need.

14. *Having then*] The particle may mean "therefore," marking logical consequence as in v. 16; or "then," indicating resumption of argument after digression as in x. 19.

a great high priest] Philo twice has "the great high priest." In 1 Macc. xiii. 42 the phrase marks a turning-point in Jewish history: cf. x. 21, xiii. 20. Here the argument begins to rise from mere analogy to the doctrine of real priesthood.

who hath passed through the heavens] Cf. 2 Cor. xii. 2, "caught up even to the third heaven." But the compound part. is the emphatic word. All that we call "heaven" has been passed through and left

fast our confession. For we have not a high priest that ¹⁵ cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as *we are*, yet without sin. Let us therefore draw near with boldness ¹⁶

behind. The real presence of God is reached. The plural certainly need not be an allusion to the rabbinic idea of successive heavens. The Hebrew word is a dual form. Yet the sing., *uranos*, is the regular rendering in LXX. The plural is common in Psalms and is found in passages which have a grand ring—poetry, prayer, &c. In this ep. the sing. is only used in ix. 24, xi. 12, xii. 26. The distinction is illustrated in the Lord's Prayer. The opening is solemn, "Our Father which art in the heavens"; the antithesis is simple, "as in heaven, also on earth."

15. *be touched with the feeling of*] Transliterated this word is *sympathise*. It is used of God in 4 Macc. v. 25; in N.T. only here and x. 34; the adj. in 1 Pet. iii. 8. Both verb and adj. possess an intensity which "compassion" and "sympathy" have lost in English; cf. Luke xxiv. 26; Acts xxvi. 23; Intr. iii. 14.

tempted...without sin] See quotation from DuBose, Intr. iii. 15. It may be asked whether our Lord was tempted or tried in all points like all men, if, as the silence of the gospels perhaps implies and ecclesiastical tradition almost asserts, He never suffered sickness; and if that be so, whether He overcame disease in and for man in the same way as He overcame sin¹. It is certainly the will of God that the evil of sickness should be overcome as much as the evil of slavery or ignorance. And perhaps the true succession of the miracles of healing is the advance of science. It seems reasonable as well as reverent to recognise a discipline of sickness; we cannot think of a discipline of sin. This ep. would seem to promise real freedom for man from sin, not from suffering.

16. *Let us...draw near*] A sacerdotal word, Lev. xxi. 17—23; cf. Ez. xlv. 9—16; it is used in 1 Pet. ii. 4, never in Paul except, somewhat strangely, 1 Tim. vi. 3. And "the throne of grace" makes one think of the mercy-seat where the LORD promised to commune with Moses, Ex. xxv. 20 ff. Thus the new and living way of x. 20 is here anticipated, and here as there "boldness" has a special force. Philo has "the altar of mercy" (cf. Statius, *Theb.* xii. 481 ff.), but the fine phrase of the ep. is probably formed on O.T. models; see especially Is. lxvi. 1. For "grace" see Hort on 1 Pet. i. 2, "It combines the force of two Hebrew words *chen* and *chesed*...*chen*, a comprehensive word, gathering up all that may be supposed to be expressed in the smile of a heavenly King looking down upon His people (Num. vi. 25)...*chesed*, the coming down of the Most High with help to the helpless (Ps. lxxxv. 7)." Cf.

¹ See a paper by the Rev. F. M. Downton in *The Cowley Evangelist*, July, 1914; and cf. note on xii. 2.

unto the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy, and may find grace to help *us* in time of need.

5 For every high priest, being taken from among men, is appointed for men in things pertaining to God, that he

Culverwell on Ps. iv. 6, "The words are plainly put up in the form of a petition to Heaven, for some smiles of love, for some propitious and favourable glances, for God's gracious presence and acceptance¹." Both "grace" and "mercy" are found in LXX as renderings of both *chen* and *chesed*, and their combination, as in this verse, is natural; cf. Wisd. iii. 9, iv. 15; 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2. *to help...in time of need*] A phrase modelled on LXX of Ps. ix. 10; cf. Ps. x. 1.

CH. V. 1—10. THE PRIESTHOOD OF OUR HIGH PRIEST FULFILS THE UNIVERSAL RULE; CONSUMMATION THROUGH INFIRMITY.

Yes, infirmity is characteristic of priesthood. For every high priest of whatever religion is taken from among men, and on men's behalf is established on the Godward side in order that he may, like any ordinary worshipper, bring gifts and sacrifices before God for relief from sins. He is himself one of the people, no austere saint in whom the passions of humanity are quenched, but one who is able to bear gently with the ignorant and wandering just because he, like them, is compassed about with infirmity, and owes the debt of moral weakness, and while he offers for the people must himself also make offering for sins. He has indeed a distinctive office. And yet that is no prize of successful effort; he is priest simply because God calls him.

So it was with Aaron. So also with the LORD'S Anointed whose priesthood is celebrated in the psalm. He did not glorify himself in order to be made high priest. God called him; God who in one psalm spoke of his sonship, in another assigned him priesthood; "Thou art priest," He said, "after the order of Melchizedek." And when this anointed Son manifested himself wholly, as Jesus Christ, the same rule held. He, in the days of His earthly sojourning, made offering of prayers and supplications, with a great cry and with tears, to Him who was able to lead Him in salvation out of the valley of death. In awful reverence He cried and at once was heard. Then, Son though He was, He learned by the sufferings appointed Him the obedience that might be achieved no other way. At last, perfected by the death through which God conducted Him, He became to all men who, obeying Him, share His obedience, author of salvation that is eternal; being hailed by God in the eternal sphere "High Priest," after the order of Melchizedek.

1. *in things pertaining to God*] See ii. 17 note.

that he may offer] This verb and its cognate noun are sacrificial words in LXX. So is the slightly varied form of the verb ("offer

¹ Campagnac, *Cambridge Platonists*, p. 263.

may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins: who can bear 2
gently with the ignorant and erring, for that he himself
also is compassed with infirmity; and by reason thereof 3
is bound, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for
sins. And no man taketh the honour unto himself, but 4
when he is called of God, even as was Aaron. So Christ 5
also glorified not himself to be made a high priest, but he
that spake unto him,

Thou art my Son,
This day have I begotten thee:

up") which is used in vii. 27. In the LXX the first form is used of the offerer bringing the victim to present before the altar, the second of the priest offering up the selected portion upon the altar (see Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, pp. 376, 389). Both sets of words are used in the Greek liturgies: the noun belonging to the second verb, *anaphora*—which does not occur in N.T.—is the title of the more solemn part of the service which begins with "Lift up your hearts," and corresponds nearly with the "canon" of the Latin mass.

for sins] With a person the prep. would mean "on behalf of." In LXX the usual phrase is "concerning sin," which is often used as a noun in itself even without the article = "sin-offering": so in Ps. xl. quoted in ch. x. The phrase used here is rare in LXX: in N.T. only in Hebrews, but cf. 1 Cor. xv. 3; Gal. i. 4. The collocation in ix. 7 suggests the feeling of the phrase.

2. *can bear gently with*] "can reasonably bear with," A.V. mg. Windisch quotes from Philo (*Leg. All.* III. p. 113), "Thou seest how the perfect one always practises the perfectly passionless state. But Aaron, who though he takes a second rank, yet at least goes on improving, allows himself a moderate compassion; for as yet he cannot quite tear out his heart and feeling." That "moderate compassion" represents the very word which our author here applies so differently.

the ignorant] In the Greek liturgies the priest prays that he may offer "for his own sins and the ignorances of the people": cf. ix. 7.

4. *even as was Aaron*] The paragraph is about high priests in general and would really be plainer without this reference to Aaron. The Greek word for "even as" is so strange that it was altered in the later text. And now we find the papyrus p¹³ does omit the clause. Intr. iv. 4.

5. *Christ*] Better "the Christ." The psalms about to be quoted referred primarily to "Christs" of O.T.; not till v. 7 is attention concentrated upon the consummator of their Christhood.

- 6 as he saith also in another *place*,
 Thou art a priest for ever
 After the order of Melchizedek.
- 7 Who in the days of his flesh, having offered up prayers
 and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him
 that was able to save him¹ from death, and having been
 8 heard for his godly fear, though he was a Son, yet learned
 9 obedience by the things which he suffered; and having
 been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey

¹ Or, *out of*

⁷ *the days of his flesh*] Cf. 2 Cor. v. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 50, and x. 20 below.

unto him that was able] Cf. Mark xiv. 35 f., "if it were possible... all things are possible unto thee." The whole passage seems to allude to Gethsemane; hardly to the narrative as it stands in any of our gospels. The clause which is doubtfully attested in Luke xxii. 43 f. perhaps indicates considerable variety in the tradition behind those gospels. The language has many affinities with the Maccabean books, 2 Macc. xi. 6; 3 Macc. i. 11, 16, vi. 13 f.

to save...from death] margin "out of death," and so Syr. "to quicken him from death"; vii. 16 and the whole idea of this ep. justify such a paraphrase, though the everyday meaning of the three Greek words would be "to save from dying."

having been heard for his godly fear] John Smith, the Cambridge Platonist, said, "*He was delivered from what he feared*; for so the words being nothing else but an Hebraism are to be rendered¹," but there are no such Hebraisms in this ep. *Pro sua reverentia* is the good translation of vg., well explained by Primasius, "Reverence sometimes stands for love, sometimes for fear; here for the supreme charity and supreme obedience of the Son of God."

8. *learned...by the things which he suffered*] Proverbial in Greek from Hdt. to Philo, but the acc. "obedience" gives the phrase distinction here.

In Ignatius "suffer" has almost the same sense as in the creed, "suffered and died." That sense is approached in ix. 26, xiii. 12; Luke xxii. 15; Acts i. 3, xvii. 3. In 1 Pet. the verb is very frequent, and generally illustrative of the idea that Christ's disciples are made one with Him by suffering. The theology of 1 Pet. iv. 1 (cf. Rom. vi. 7) is near akin to that of our author, but less carefully expressed: "Forasmuch then as Christ suffered in the flesh, arm ye yourselves also with the same mind, for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin."

¹ Campagnac, p. 156.

him the¹ author of eternal salvation; named of God a high 10 priest after the order of Melchizedek.

¹ Gr. *cause*.

9. *the author of eternal salvation*] A phrase twice found in Philo. The Greek for "author" ("cause" in margin) is a more philosophical term than that in ii. 10.

10. *named*] or "hailed." Cf. i Macc. xiv. 40, and Clem. xvii., a ch. which has other coincidences with the ep. The parts. "having been made perfect" (catching here that shade of meaning which it has in Wisd. iv. 13, "perfected by death") and "named" are grammatically synchronous, both marking a moment just anterior to "became." But the emphatic epithet "eternal" complicates the symmetry. It might be said that "became" depends on "made perfect" grammatically, philosophically on "named." For "eternal" in this ep. is quasi-philosophical: cf. vi. 2, ix. 12, 14 f., xiii. 20. It mingles in conversational freedom ideas from O.T. and from the Alexandrine schools. In LXX *aeon* = Hebrew 'olam, "age," and *aeonian* or "eternal" represents the same noun modified by dependent words; it means in general "everlasting." In Philo *chronos* is distinguished from *aeon* as the measurable system of days, years, &c. which is but an image of the archetypal *aeon*; for *aeon* is the life of the "intelligible" world and must be sought among the immaterial things of the pure intellect (*Quis rerum div.* p. 496, *De mut. nom.* p. 619). This is like Plato in *Timaeus*, 37 D, E; time with its parts is an eternal image of the eternity which has no parts or tenses. Only in calling the image also "eternal" Plato shews the difference between his true idealism and the vulgar fancy of "two worlds" which most of his successors indulged in (Intr. III. 32); moreover Plato is not speaking here with philosophic strictness. He is dealing with the "eternal," not with the "intelligible," and only gives a poetic hint, in picturesque terms, of "time untimed." Our author is nearer Plato than Philo in this respect. He has not thought out the problem so far as perhaps S. John did. But in his free artistic deepening of O.T. phrases he does so use "eternal" that at each of its occurrences the reader must pause, as though before the opening of a spiritual vista which outshines the current thought. "Divine" would be no rendering, but a suggestive substitution. After all the usage of O.T., to a sympathetic reader, will seem different in degree, not kind: see esp. Psalms, and Eccl. iii. 11 R.V. mg.

CHS. V. 11—VI. 8. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO SINK THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY: RETURN TO THE SIMPLICITY OF CHILDHOOD WOULD BE UNMANLY BETRAYAL OF OUR LORD.

Of Melchizedek our discourse might be much, and it would be difficult to explain in sufficient argument what we mean by

putting his priesthood in the same line as our Lord's, since of late you have grown so lazy-eared. For just when you ought to be commencing teachers, now that you have been so long in our Christian school, you say that you yourselves have need of a repetition of the old pre-Christian teaching as to what the very elements of the earliest lessons in the oracles of God may mean. You have come round again to this; you have need (such is your iterated plaint) of the milk of simple religion, not of the strong food of the controversy between the Churches. I play upon your words as you do upon our master Paul's. But I am anxious. For any one who casts in his lot with that kind of simplicity, avoids the discipline which produces a reasoned morality; he is in fact a babe. And full-grown men do require the strong food; the kind of men, I mean, who by reason of habitual exercise have their faculties in good training, so that they can discern in a crisis between the noble course and the base.

Wherefore let us leave behind the simple theme of the mere origins of Messianic doctrine, and let us be borne onward by the tide of duty to the consummation of that doctrine in thought and action. Let us not be laying over again a foundation for the conventional religious life of renouncing the works of the devil and of faith towards God; the foundation which consists of teaching about ceremonial washings, and imposition of hands, about the resurrection of the dead, and judgement at the eternal assize. And indeed we are to go forward, if, as I surely believe, God will presently commission us for a time of trial.

It is a critical hour. For as to your plan of shirking responsibility by retiring into the Church of your fathers, that is in the very nature of things impossible. Your eyes have been opened once for all to the truth; you know the taste of the gracious gift that comes from heaven; you have become members of the body which the Holy Spirit vivifies; you have tasted the excellence of God's promise; you have anticipated its fulfilment in the age that is to come when our Lord comes as Christ triumphant, for you already experience the spiritual powers that issue therefrom. That is Christianity; not an academic problem, but a profound spiritual experience, a gift received, a loyalty to be rendered. If you fall away from this, it is impossible to start you again fair and fresh in the recovered simplicity of childhood's mind, while by the very act of this fresh start you are crucifying the Son of God—not being "crucified with Christ," but crucifying Him for your pleasure and putting Him to open shame by the renunciation of allegiance which your new life will daily proclaim.

Take a parable from Genesis to enforce my warning. The ground that (in the time of man's innocency) drinks the rain which comes often upon it and brings forth herb meet for those for whose sake it is also, by God's ordinance, tilled, partakes of the blessing of the whole creation. But when (after the mortal change) it produces thorns and thistles, it is reprobate and nigh the fulfil-

Of ¹whom we have many things to say, and hard of ¹¹ interpretation, seeing ye are become dull of hearing. For ¹² when by reason of the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again ²that some one teach you the rudiments of the ³first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of solid food. For every one that partaketh of milk is without experience ¹³ of the word of righteousness; for he is a babe. But solid ¹⁴ food is for ⁴fullgrown men, *even* those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern good and evil.

Wherefore let us ⁵cease to speak of the first principles ⁶ of Christ, and press on unto ⁶perfection; not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith

¹ Or, *which*

² Or, *that one teach you which be the rudiments*

³ Gr. *beginning*.

⁴ Or, *perfect*

⁵ Gr. *leave the word of the beginning of Christ*.

⁶ Or, *full growth*

ment of the curse which God pronounced, and its destiny is to be cleansed of its weeds by fire.

11. *Of whom, &c.*] Cf. Dion. Hal. *De comp.* VIII., "concerning which things speech is abundant and speculation deep." These four verses are more than usually tinged with the literary flavour of the period, but beneath the surface they are biblical. S. Paul had written about "rudiments," Gal. iv. 3 (where see Lightfoot's note), and 9, Col. ii. 8, 20, and about "feeding babes with milk," 1 Cor. iii. 1 f.; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 2. The author gives a half playful turn to words which he and his friends knew well (cf. xiii. 25). Then in the next paragraph this friendly intimacy passes into the severity of anxious love.

12. *that some one teach*] So W.H. But most ancient authority is for *teach you which be* (marg.). It is again as in iii. 17 the ambiguity of indefinite or interrogative pronoun. Greek ears could perhaps catch the rythm better than ours, the bare, active inf. is untranslatable but idiomatic, "which be the rudiments" has a touch of lively irony, "some one" is a mannerism already repeated to satiety, and on the whole it seems better to read the interrogative with A.V., and probably (among the ancients) Euthalius.

VI. 1. *the first principles of Christ*] The literal translation of margin "the word of the beginning of Christ," better "of the Christ," makes the meaning plainer. See paraphrase and Intr. III. 18 and 28, and note on i. 5. That knowledge of "the Christ" is signified which Judaism learned from O.T.

dead works] Elsewhere in N.T. this word for "dead" is used

² toward God, ¹ of the teaching of ² baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of

¹ Some ancient authorities read, even *the teaching of*.

² Or, *washings*

only of persons, except Rom. vii. 8, viii. 10, and Jas. ii. 17—26, where it is predicate to "sin," "body," "faith." Tertullian felt the personal sense so strongly that he translated here "works of dead men." The metaphor is bold, "deeds which belong to that realm of death" spoken of in ii. 15. There is probably no thought of Paul's "works of merit."

2. *of the teaching*] But the reading of the margin "even the teaching" has strong attestation and, making a certain ecclesiastical system the foundation of repentance and faith, suits one interpretation of the passage very well. With the genitive, the foundation is not defined; "laying foundation" is but an ornamental phrase for starting upon repentance, faith, doctrine of washings, &c.

It will be noticed that all the elements of this foundation belong to Judaism as much as to the Christian faith. They are the "rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God" as held by a Pharisee like S. Paul or a Hellenistic Jew like S. Stephen before their conversion to Christianity. The plural "washings" (see margin) occurs again at ix. 10 of Jewish "washings"; cf. Mark vii. 4, 8; Lev. xiv. 7 f., xvi. 4, 24, 26, 28, &c.¹ For "laying on of hands" cf. Acts vi. 6, viii. 17, ix. 17, xiii. 3, xix. 6, xxviii. 8; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6; also Lev. i. 4, &c., xvi. 21; Num. xxvii. 18. For "resurrection" and "eternal judgement" cf. Acts xxiii. 6, xxiv. 15, 25; Dan. xii. 2 f.; 2 Macc. vii., and the teaching of our Lord in the gospels. Of course the last three doctrines were inherited by the Christian Church. That can hardly be said of the (plural) "washings," and this phrase seems to make it plain that "the foundation of repentance and faith" which the readers of the ep. propose to lay again would be, should they carry out their proposal, a return to the Jewish Church. This they think an abandonment of useless controversy, a simple and sufficient basis of noble life and true faith in God. Their friend answers that their purpose is an "impossible" (v. 4) one. They would be abandoning not useless theological controversy, but their Lord himself to whom (whatever they think of the doctrine of His Person) they have given allegiance. Their new start in the simple faith of their fathers would be an act of gross dishonour; it would not be a new start at all, but a base desertion. The idea is in the very nature of things impossible. Intr. III. 1—3, 20.

¹ For the "baptism" of proselytes, &c., see Box and Oesterley, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, ch. xiii.

eternal judgement. And this will we do, if God permit. ³ For as touching those who were once enlightened ¹ and ⁴ tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and ² tasted the good word of God, and ⁵ the powers of the age to come, and *then* fell away, it is ⁶ impossible to renew them again unto repentance; ³ seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put

¹ Or, *having both tasted of...and being made...and having tasted &c.*

² Or, *tasted the word of God that it is good* ³ Or, *the while*

3. *if God permit*] Perhaps "commission" rather than "permit." The nature of the commission may be inferred from x. 25, xii. 4, xiii. 3.

4. *enlightened*] In eccl. writers this verb and its noun mean the illumination of baptism. This passage and x. 32 perhaps lead up to that technical usage. For the tense cf. Rom. xiii. 11. The following phrases carry on the description of the manifold character of "the new life." They are tersely suggestive and lose their pregnancy by detailed explanation. A few parallels will shew how church tradition lies behind the whole passage: "heavenly gift," 2 Cor. ix. 15; 2 Pet. i. 3, 4; "the good word of God," or better "how good is the word of God" (margin), 1 Pet. i. 24 f.; "the power of the age to come," Luke i. 17, v. 17; 1 Cor. v. 4; Gal. iii. 5. For "partakers of the Holy Ghost" it is unnecessary to quote. It is taken for granted throughout Acts and epistles that the Christian life is new life springing from the Holy Spirit, the life-giver. But the form of the phrase indicates rather strikingly one characteristic of this thought as N.T. holds it. In F. D. Maurice's words, "The Spirit dwells in the Body, and in each of its members *as such*, and not in individuals. The Spirit in an individual is a fearful contradiction," *Life*, i. p. 209. For absence of art. before "Holy Ghost" in the Greek see Intr. iii. 29, iv. 1, but here the style of the context would be sufficient explanation.

5. *the powers of the age to come*] In Tertullian's copy what might be a full line in a papyrus roll had dropped out, and he translated the resulting words with dark grandeur *occidente iam aevo*, "at the sunset of the world." Intr. ii. 3.

6. *renew...again...crucify...afresh*] The usual N.T. word for "crucify" means in classical Greek "make a palisade." This writer prefers classical language and therefore uses the proper compound verb: cf. xii. 28 note. Intr. iv. 1. Neither verb carries the meaning "again" in itself. What is implied may be seen by comparing Gal. ii. 19, iv. 19; when one entered the Christian family he shared the crucifixion of his Lord and so found the Lord's life his own. If these disciples desert Christ they are enacting the crucifixion in

- 7 him to an open shame. For the land which hath drunk
the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs
meet for them for whose sake it is also tilled, receiveth
8 blessing from God: but if it beareth thorns and thistles, it
is rejected and nigh unto a curse; whose end is to be
burned.
- 9 But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you,
and things that ¹accompany salvation, though we thus
10 speak: for God is not unrighteous to forget your work and

¹ Or, *are near to*

another manner, declaring their fellowship with the crucifiers instead of with the Crucified. For "put to open shame," literally "make a paradigm of," cf. iv. 11 with Gal. iii. 1; Matt. x. 33; Mark ix. 39; Luke xii. 9; 1 Cor. xii. 3, and Matt. i. 19.

7 f. An analogy in confirmation of what has been said, drawn from Scripture; cf. Gen. i. 11 f., iii. 17 f.

CH. VI. 9—12. YOU ARE DILIGENT IN CHARITY; BE ZEALOUS ALSO IN THEOLOGY.

But we have really no doubt about you, my very dear friends; you are certainly destined for those grander efforts which lay fast hold of salvation, even though we do speak thus. For God is not a taskmaster, too austere to care for equity. He does not forget your work and the love of which you gave proof in the service you devoted to the honour of His name. You ministered in former days to His covenanted saints, in whom the ancient communion in His name is continued and renewed. You are still ministering to them. And God whose memory is effective love will not let you break away from our loving fellowship. But we set our heart on your doing something further. We would have each one of you continue to prove the same zeal in another line of service; i.e. in expanding, deepening and assuring our common hope till at last, matured, it passes into fulfilment. That is the impulse which we desire to save you from treating with lazy indifference, and so to make you imitators of your companions in the faith who through loyal trust in God and a steady enduring spirit are entering upon the inheritance of the ancient promises in all their modern complexity.

9. *accompany* (margin *are near to*) *salvation*] Hdt. often uses this construction as periphrasis, e.g. = "dream-matter." But the object "salvation" rather recalls such personal usage as in Eur. fr. *Ino*, "lay hold of a noble hope": cf. xii. 5.

10. *not unrighteous*] Cf. God's "righteousness" in O.T., e.g. Ps. ciii. 17.

the love which ye shewed toward his name, in that ye ministered unto the saints, and still do minister. And we ¹¹ desire that each one of you may shew the same diligence unto the ¹fulness of hope even to the end: that ye be not ¹² sluggish, but imitators of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.

¹ Or, *full assurance*

the love] Most mss., but hardly one of weight, prefix "labour of" (from 1 Thess. i. 3).

the saints] = "the Christians," but in this ep. only so here and xiii. 24 (cf. iii. 1). This is the regular use in Paul. Lightfoot, on Phil. i. 1, explains it as "a term transferred from the old dispensation to the new"; Israel had been chosen by God as His "holy" or "saintly people"; the Israelites were called in LXX "the saints"; now the Christian Church takes over the title; the main idea is "consecration." Perhaps it may be added that in his two earliest epp., to the Thessalonians, Paul uses the word in a rather different sense of the "holy ones" who shall accompany the Christ at His advent, 1 Thess. iii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 10. Is it possible that this apocalyptic colour always affects his application of the term? Cf. below, x. 25, xii. 14, and 1 Cor. vi. 1 f.

11. *each one*] Cf. "any one," iii. 12 f., iv. 1, 11. It is correlative to the affectionate "beloved" frequent in Paul; the writer is very anxious for his friends and "calleth them all by their names."

fulness] Cf. x. 22; 1 Thess. i. 5; Luke i. 1; Col. ii. 2, where Lightfoot says that "full assurance" seems to be the meaning of this substantive wherever it occurs in N.T. (so margin and A.V.). Elsewhere only in ecclesiastical writers, e.g. Clem. xlii., "with full assurance of the Holy Spirit."

12. *inherit*] as in i. 14. Abraham "found" the promise (15); he did not "carry home the harvest" (x. 36, xi. 39). That remained for those who "in the end of these days" are entering into the various labours of their predecessors (John iv. 37). The word was suggested to the author by the quotation he is about to make (14) from Gen. xxii. 17, where the sentence continues, "and thy seed shall inherit."

13—20. THE OATH OF GOD, AND THE ANCHOR OF HOPE.

The promises are ancient, and they are a real ground for hope. For it was to Abraham that God made promise. And since He had no greater person to swear by, He swore (we read) by Himself, saying "Surely, with great blessing will I bless thee, and with great abundance will I multiply thee." And that was how Abraham, after spirited endurance, met with his promise. An encouragement to us as well as to him. For when mere men swear, they swear by some one who is greater than themselves, and however hot their

13 For when God made promise to Abraham, since he
 14 could swear by none greater, he swore by himself, saying,
 Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will
 15 multiply thee. And thus, having patiently endured, he
 16 obtained the promise. For men swear by the greater: and

dispute, it is brought to a close and the agreement is decisively fixed by an oath. And so it was by oath that God, deliberately purposing to demonstrate with excessive clearness to the future heirs of the promise made to Abraham the unalterable firmness of His plan, took the position of an umpire between himself and Abraham. He bound himself by an oath sworn by His own person, in order that, through two unalterable sanctions—the oath He swore and His own Divinity that He swore by—we may have strong encouragement. We were the final cause, we who have now fled for refuge from the storm of this troubled world to seize the hope thus long ago held forth to us. That hope we are attached to as an anchor to which we may entrust the keeping of more than physical life; an anchor soundly forged and firm in its hold. Such an anchor as it drops into the mysterious deep and bites the ground is a symbol of the high priest's entry into the presence of God behind the sanctuary veil. And indeed One has entered into that presence as a forerunner of our own entry to do priestly service there for us, namely Jesus. He entered at the moment of His death, having in that moment become "High Priest," "after the order of Melchizedek," "eternally."

he swore by himself] Philo (*Legg. All.* III. p. 127) presses the argument from the phrase of LXX in the same manner.

14. *Surely*] An oath-formula not unfrequent in LXX and with slightly different spelling quite classical; in N.T. the quotation here is the only instance.

blessing I will bless] A common mode of representing an emphatic Hebrew idiom which throws the stress on the root idea of the verb; so A.V. and R.V. in Luke xxii. 15, where A.V. mg. is less good. Moulton calls it "possible, but unidiomatic Greek¹."

15. *he obtained*] The part. attached here, and the context in xi. 33, shew that this word implies boldness in accepting a promise of which the fulfilment is hidden in the future. It means properly to fall in with on the way; cf. Thomas Aquinas' prayer, "Concede mihi dilectum filium tuum, quem nunc velatum in via suscipere propono, revelata tandem facie perpetuo contemplari." "Grant that thy beloved Son, whom I now prepare to receive veiled on the way, may at last with unveiled face be mine to contemplate continually." A Christian gem in Brit. Mus. has a fish and anchor with the imperative of this verb as motto².

¹ *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, p. 76, Clark, 1906.

² Westcott, *Religious Thought in the West*, p. 307.

in every dispute of theirs the oath is final for confirmation. Wherein God, being minded to shew more abundantly 17 unto the heirs of the promise the immutability of his counsel,¹ interposed with an oath: that by two immutable 18 things, in which it is impossible for God to lie, we may have a strong encouragement, who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us; which we have as an 19 anchor of the soul, *a hope* both sure and stedfast and

¹ Gr. *mediated*.

18. *in which it is impossible for God to lie*] Num. xxiii. 19; 1 Sam. xv. 29; the name "God" stands in Greek emphatically at the end of the clause. Cf. xiii. 16, Clem. xxvii. "nothing is impossible with God except to lie."

19. *the soul*] *psyche*, which in iv. 12 seems to signify one of the physical elements in man's constitution, his living power as distinguished from (what is intimately connected therewith) his *pneuma* or breath. Yet even there the physical analysis is an illustration of the keener analysis of conscience by God's Word. Here "soul" evidently has a higher meaning in itself. The following extract from Coleridge¹ explains this meaning: "Life is the one universal soul, which, by virtue of the enlivening Breath and the informing Word, all organised bodies have in common, each after its kind. This, therefore, all animals possess, and man as an animal. But, in addition to this, God transfused into man a higher gift, and specially inbreathed:—even a living (that is, self-subsisting) soul, a soul having its life in itself. *And man became a living soul*. He did not merely possess it, he became it. It was his proper being, his truest self, the man in the man." Coleridge perhaps refines too subtly upon the Hebrew idiom of Gen. ii. 7. But he has caught the main feeling of the O.T., viz. that the natural and spiritual are one: and natural life has moral and so eternal life folded up within it. One writer of O.T. questioned the sharp division between the "soul" of man and the "life" of brutes, Eccl. iii. 21 R.V. Perhaps that writer's real thought went deeper than his cynical expression of it. And perhaps there is just a hint in our author of sympathy with his question. In x. 34, xii. 3, he seems to recognise that a man's "very self" is a deeper reality than even his "soul." Hort's notes on the word in 1 Pet. i. 9, 22, ii. 11, should be read².

¹ *Aids to Reflection*, Introd. Aphorisms, ix.

² Cf. also Wallace, *Lectures and Essays*, pp. 231 f., 204. App. A of Edwards' *English-Greek Lexicon* gives briefly the classical usage. And very instructive is Burnet's *Socratic doctrine of the Soul* (Milford for the British Academy, 1916), in which the high Platonic idea of soul, as that true life which a man ought most to care for, is proved to have been originated by Socrates,

20 entering into that which is within the veil; whither as a forerunner Jesus entered for us, having become a high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

7 For this Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of God Most High, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter
2 of the kings, and blessed him, to whom also Abraham divided a tenth part of all (being first, by interpretation, King of righteousness, and then also King of Salem,
3 which is, King of peace; without father, without mother,

entering into] i.e. the anchor, to which the hope, according to a common metaphor of Greek writers of every period, is compared. To break the metaphor at this point and apply the participle merely to the hope is tame. And the harshness is lessened when "entering into that which is within the veil" is recognised as all but a quotation from the well-known account of the day of atonement in Lev. xvi. This quotation is introduced in order to bring the argument back to Melchizedek and priesthood. The general picture is one of three noticeable ones with which the ep. is punctuated, cf. xii. 1 f., xiii. 11 f. The faithful are likened to the crew of the ship which has run to port from the storm. The anchor, dropped into the mysterious deep, already holds the ground. The captain has gone ashore, and the crew await orders to follow him. The imagery is only touched in with a stroke or two. But the point is that the submerged bottom which the anchor holds is continuous with the shore. So in ix. 4 the altar of incense "belongs to" the Holy of holies, in xii. 22 the readers have "come to" the heavenly Sion; all this is "near to salvation," vi. 9.

CH. VII. 1—3. MELCHIZEDEK THE TYPE.

Melchizedek; for now I am going to talk about him after all. See him, as he appears in that mysterious chapter of Genesis; king of Salem, priest of God Most High; who met Abraham as he was returning from the slaughter of the kings and blessed him; to whom also Abraham gave as portion a full tithe of all the spoil:—he being first by the interpretation of his name King of righteousness, and then also being entitled King of Salem, which is King of peace; one to whom no father, mother or descent is assigned; one who has neither beginning of days nor end of life in the history;—we behold in short a picture drawn after the likeness of that Son of God whom antiquity faintly discerned, and whose true features we have learned to-day from those who saw the Lord and by our own communion with Him:—this Melchizedek abides a priest continuously.

For Melchizedek see Gen. xiv. and for the meaning of "priesthood after the order of Melchizedek" see Intr. III. 10.

without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God), abideth a priest continually.

Now consider how great this man was, unto whom⁴ Abraham, the patriarch, gave a tenth out of the chief

3. *without genealogy*] Gen. says nothing about Melchizedek's father, mother or descent; none could declare his "generation," cf. Is. liii. 8 (LXX).

made like unto] a word used of statues or pictures that "resemble" their original. Melchizedek is like our Lord, not our Lord like him.

continually] x. 1, 12, 14. The author uses this phrase when he wishes to express the simple idea of time. It is frequent in Greek inscriptions. In x. 12, 14 our version gives "for ever" as its equivalent: contrast x. 1. This is misleading as "for ever" elsewhere represents "unto the aeon" and stands for something more than duration of time: cf. note on v. 9.

4—10. A GREATER PRIEST THAN LEVI.

Look at him. What a large figure he stands there; one to whom Abraham gave tithe of the choicest spoils, Abraham the first father of our holy race. It is true that those who, being of the sons of Levi, receive the legal office of the priesthood, are authorised to tithe the people of God according to the Mosaic Law, that is their own brothers; the family of Abraham is quite accustomed to being tithed by their own kin. But here is one who does not count his ancestry from the sons of Levi, and he has exacted tithe from Abraham, and upon the holder of the divine promises himself he has pronounced blessing. Now there is no dispute at all about the principle, Less receives blessing from greater. And while in our nation mere men, dying one after the other in the course of nature, take tithes, in that ancient mystery it is a far greater Person who takes them, One who, according to the witness of Scripture, absolutely lives. Indeed we may almost venture to reduce it all to the matter-of-fact assertion that through Abraham Levi also the tithe-taker has been tithed, for as Levi had not yet been born, he was still part of Abraham his ancestor when that meeting with Melchizedek took place.

4. *how great*] Rather "how large," cf. Gal. vi. 11, or "how old." There seems no parallel in Greek literature for the meaning "how great in character." And the word here translated "consider" (different from iii. 1) is probably used as in Luke and Acts of literal "seeing," not as in John. This is one of the author's bold, vivid phases—"what a big one." The "apodeictic" "this man" adds to the effect.

the patriarch] Here in this title which closes it in the Greek is

5 spoils. And they indeed of the sons of Levi that receive the priest's office have commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, 6 though these have come out of the loins of Abraham: but he whose genealogy is not counted from them hath taken tithes of Abraham, and hath blessed him that hath the 7 promises. But without any dispute the less is blessed of 8 the better. And here men that die receive tithes; but 9 there one, of whom it is witnessed that he liveth. And, so to say, through Abraham even Levi, who receiveth 10 tithes, hath paid tithes; for he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchizedek met him.

the true emphasis of the sentence, cf. xi. 17. The "even" of A.V. comes from a somewhat inferior group of mss. and suggests a false emphasis. The commas of R.V. do good service here. A reader, attending to them, would produce the same effect as the Greek does by its order. For "patriarch" cf. Acts ii. 29, vii. 8, and 4 Macc. vii. 19, xvi. 25, an Alexandrine work which "approaches nearer than any other book of the Greek Bible to the models of Hellenic philosophy and rhetoric" (Swete).

8. *of whom it is witnessed*] The grandeur of this undefined part. is more easily expressed in the Latin versions than in English; R.V. "one" suggests "one man" in the context, and hardly improves upon A.V.

9. *so to say*] Here R.V. is not satisfactory. Not "as it were" but "one might almost say" is the meaning of this Greek idiom.

11—25. THE MORAL NECESSITY FOR THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD TO PASS AWAY.

So then Levi is demonstrated less than Melchizedek. And now let us come somewhat nearer to reality in considering why our Lord should be priest after the order of Melchizedek, not of Levi.

The real reason is the failure of the Levitical priesthood to achieve what priesthood is meant to achieve. For if the Levitical priesthood had achieved that, what need would there still have been for a psalmist to prophesy that after the order of Melchizedek a quite different priest should arise, and so be reckoned *not* after the order of Aaron? We see from the book of Leviticus that the whole law for Israel rests upon the institution of Aaronic priesthood. The psalmist's word is therefore a bold one. It is the sacred law of Moses that he is daring to repeal, for the law goes with the priesthood. He speaks boldly and therefore with as deep a significance as may be conceived. And so I do not scruple to

believe that he spoke prophetically of our Lord Jesus Christ, and contemplated an astonishing break with ancestral faith and custom in these days of ours. For He towards whom this oracle is directed is a member of a different tribe from Levi, and of His tribe no one has ever paid any attention to the service of the altar. That is plain, for every one knows that it is from Judah that our Lord is sprung, and Moses never said a word about priests with reference to the tribe of Judah.

And to come back from contemporary fact to scriptural inference, the setting aside of the merely instituted priesthood of Aaron is even more plainly commended, if the oracle be true, and if after a real, moral likeness to Melchizedek there is to arise a priest of so different a character that he has entered upon his office, not according to law, which (for all its divine sanction) is nothing but a material system of authority, but according to the ever freshly operating power of life which passes indissolubly through death. For that is what the witness of Genesis as completed by the psalmist means—"Thou art a priest eternally after the order of Melchizedek." It means first indeed that an ordinance we have received from the church of our fathers is being set aside to-day, because it has proved weak and useless; for the Law has really accomplished nothing of that priestly mediation for which it was designed. But more important is this; a stronger kind of hope is being brought forward in its place, through the transforming power of which we are in these days of change and trial actually entering into the presence of God.

And there is also that matter of the oath. Whatever divine sanction there may have been for the Levitical priesthood, the sons of Aaron have become priests without an oath from God to establish them, but this priest received his priesthood with the giving of an oath by God through the psalmist who brought God's word to him—"The Lord sware, and will not repent; Thou art priest eternally." This oath implies covenant, and makes a great difference. Our Priest has become surety for a covenant, and a greater covenant than even Abraham knew. And what this suretyship means we remember when we call Him Jesus, the man who suffered for us.

And yet another point. Those priests have been appointed one after the other in considerable numbers. They had to be, for they were always prevented by death from lasting out the office which itself survived them. But our Priest "abides" "eternally"; and so the priesthood which He holds can never be passed on to another. Hence He is able to *save*, and that all-completely, those who from generation to generation draw near through His priestly aid to God; seeing that at all times He is living to do in the reality of the eternal sphere all that the analogy of priesthood indicates for a priest to do after he has offered his sacrifice. This He does uninterruptedly on their behalf.

11 Now if there was perfection through the Levitical
priesthood (for under it hath the people received the law),
what further need *was there* that another priest should
arise after the order of Melchizedek, and not be reckoned
12 after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being
changed, there is made of necessity a change also ¹of the
13 law. For he of whom these things are said ²belongeth to
another tribe, from which no man hath given attendance
14 at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord hath sprung
out of Judah; as to which tribe Moses spake nothing
15 concerning priests. And *what we say* is yet more abundantly
evident, if after the likeness of Melchizedek there ariseth
16 another priest, who hath been made, not after the law
of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an
17 ³endless life: for it is witnessed *of him*,

Thou art a priest for ever

After the order of Melchizedek.

18 For there is a disannulling of a foregoing commandment

¹ Or, *of law*

² Gr. *hath partaken of*. See ch. ii. 14.

³ Gr. *indissoluble*.

11. *perfection*] Cf. ii. 10, vi. 27, ix. 12, x. 19—22, xii. 28 f., xiii. 13 f. Windisch quotes *Testament of Levi* xviii. 1 f., “and after their visitation from the Lord the priesthood shall fail, and then the Lord will raise up a new priest to whom all the words of the Lord will be revealed,” and viii. 14, “and a king shall arise from Judah and he shall make a new priesthood.” He thinks this clause (viii. 14) a Christian interpolation; Charles thinks it proves a Maccabean date.

13. *hath given attendance at*] R.V. notices the perf. tense which A.V. misses. But the rendering of both is a little confused. It seems to follow the Latin versions with a kind of allusion to the common, and regular LXX meaning of the verb “pay attention to.”

14. *our Lord*] Cf. ii. 3. The familiar title goes naturally with “it is evident,” “obvious, as a historical fact”; contrast the slightly different word in the next verse which implies “evident by inference, logically.”

16. *endless*] Cf. 4 Macc. x. 11, “endless torments,” but the idea here is far deeper. It is part of the whole conception of death revealed by the cross as a mysterious act of one indissoluble (marg.) life, which conception is characteristic of this ep. Like “soul,” “life” is a physical term with sacramental extension: John i. 4.

18. *a disannulling, &c.*] How bold this declaration is, may be seen from Lev. xxix. 9, “and priesthood shall be theirs for ever.”

because of its weakness and unprofitableness (for the law ¹⁹ made nothing perfect), and a bringing in thereupon of a better hope, through which we draw nigh unto God. And ²⁰ inasmuch as *it is* not without the taking of an oath (for ²¹ they indeed have been made priests without an oath; but he with an oath ¹ by him that saith ² of him,

The Lord sware and will not repent himself,

Thou art a priest for ever);

by so much also hath Jesus become the surety of a better ²² ³covenant. And they indeed have been made priests many ²³ in number, because that by death they are hindered from continuing: but he, because he abideth for ever, ²⁴ hath his ²⁵ priesthood ⁵unchangeable. Wherefore also he is able to ²⁵ save ⁶to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.

¹ Or, *through*

² Or, *unto*

³ Or, *testament*

⁴ Or, *hath a priesthood that doth not pass to another*

⁵ Or, *inviolable*

⁶ Gr. *completely*.

21. *after the order of Melchizedek*] was added from v. 17 at an early stage, but the authorities against it are decisive. It is otiose and muffles the crash of the argument.

22. *a better covenant*] “Covenant,” *diatheke* in LXX, *berith* Hebrew, is an idea which fills O.T. What has already been said about Abraham and the Law (12) implies it, cf. Gen. xv. 18; Ex. xxiv. 7. The word itself is introduced here to prepare for fuller treatment in the next two chapters. That here, at any rate, it is used in the O.T. sense, is proved by the addition of “surety,” for neither a “testament” nor an “agreement” in Greek law required a surety. The word for “surety” is ordinary Greek: “mediator” (only once in LXX, Job ix. 33, though the thought is found in Deut. v. 5) is found in Philo and late Greek as well as in N.T. In this ep. it is used only of Christ, viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24; elsewhere 1 Tim. ii. 5 of Christ, Gal. iii. 19 f. of Moses. Here it might have caused confusion, coming so soon after vi. 17, and “surety” has a more affectionate ring, cf. Sir. xxix. 15, “Forget not the good offices of thy surety; for he hath given his life for thee.” It gives a hint of the reason for “better” which will be shewn in full presently.

25. *to make intercession*] Perhaps suggested by Rom. viii. 26 f., where the Spirit, and 34, where Christ “maketh intercession.” In Romans vg. has *postulat*, here the celebrated phrase *semper vivens ad interpellandum pro eis*.

- 26 For such a high priest became us, holy, guileless,
 undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than
 27 the heavens; who needeth not daily, like those high priests,
 to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the

26—28. OUR HIGH PRIEST, ETERNAL, SON OF GOD.

A long argument, but now you have the heart of it. For such a High Priest as my last words describe is the High Priest for whom we were always waiting. He is God's loving saint, doing no ill, pure from the least stain, now quite removed from the hindrance that sinful men could cause to His perfect work, and lifted high above the highest symbols that we know. He is One who hath no need (as the high priests on earth have) to multiply sacrifices day after day, first for His own sins and then for those of the people. Nothing less than that effective two-fold offering did He make once for all when He offered up Himself, visibly on the cross, eternally in heaven. Once for all; for there is the difference. The law of Moses, literal and fixed, appoints mortal men to be priests, with an inherent weakness, that repeatedly saps their priesthood. The living reason with which God swears His oath of appointment after the discipline of law has failed, exalts a Son, "eternally," for the consummation of His filial work.

26. *became us*] An interesting but not really authoritative group of MSS. prefixes "even." This is attractive yet after all it weakens the sense. It is indeed a startling assertion that such a High Priest "became" us, cf. ii. 10, Ps. lxiv. (lxv.) 1; but the sublime description of this High Priest, and the paradox of His priestly offering, are what the author would chiefly desire to be noticed.

holy] A different word from iii. 1. It comes often in Psalms for *chased*, in English versions "saint." The *chasedim* were the little band who stood with Judas Maccabaeus as martyrs for the faith. This ep. is an encouragement, xii. 4 f., xiii. 22, to just that kind of martyrdom, and a like spirit breathes through the Psalter. But the word had a tender and beautiful sense of its own before it received that associated splendour. Cheyne translates, "the man of love," God's "duteous loving ones"; for *chased* is connected with *chesed* "lovingkindness," the special attribute of God in Hosea¹. The epithets that follow may be illustrated from Philo's allegorisings of high priesthood, but the terse language of the ep. touches the heart as Philo does not. The author is thinking of One who had really lived on earth as man. In "separated from sinners" he does indeed pass to the exalted state of this High Priest, cf. ix. 28, xii. 2, but it is still the manhood that is exalted, and carries our affection with it. Intr. III. 7.

¹ *The Book of Psalms, or the praises of Israel*, pp. 9, 29, 141.

sins of the people: for this he did once for all, when he offered up himself. For the law appointeth men high 28 priests, having infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was after the law, *appointeth* a Son, perfected for evermore.

27. *when he offered up*] A noticeable group of mss. have simply "offered." If the distinction noticed on v. 1 be true, this would seem to refer to the death on the cross, wherein our Lord, before becoming High Priest, gave Himself to be the victim, whereas "to offer up," just before, refers to His function as High Priest in heaven. But textual authority is not in favour of the verbal distinction, and the idea itself cannot be analysed with so mechanical a logic. The sacrifice on the cross is sacramental: earth and heaven, now and after, are not twain and separated; they stand to one another as outward visible sign to inward spiritual reality. Intr. III. 8, 32.

More important it is to notice that "this" implies all that follows "needeth not." The sacrifice needs no repetition, but when the Lord offered it, He offered "for his own sins" as well as for the people's. In what sense that should be understood may be gathered from ix. 28; 1 Pet. ii. 21—24 (a passage which also explains "guileless, undefiled"); Gal. iii. 13. The N.T. doctrine is deeper than "vicarious suffering." Intr. III. 15.

28. *the word of the oath*] Rather "the divine reason with which God sware" than "His commanding utterance" or "our argument about the oath-giving." This vigorous conclusion brings us face to face at last with the practical earnestness of the author. Philo and Leviticus, whose fashion and speech he has partly followed in the preceding paragraphs, only reach the threshold of his house of thought.

CH. VIII. 1—13. THE NEW COVENANT.

Here is the climax of the argument: our High Priest's work is real, it is not limited by the terms of the analogy. Such a High Priest as has been described we certainly have. When He was enthroned in essential unity with the Godhead in heaven, He entered on a priestly service which is no less essentially divine. It belongs to the sanctuary and tabernacle of truth not of appearance; the tabernacle or tent, says Scripture, which the Lord pitched, not man. For Scripture hallows this picture-language of analogy, and as every high priest is appointed for the offering of gifts and sacrifices, we say of our High Priest too that it was necessary for Him to have a "sacrifice" to "offer." Now if He had remained on earth to exercise His priesthood, He would not have been a priest at all. There was no room among the regular priests with their traditional ceremonial for His quite different action to be counted

8 ¹Now ²in the things which we are saying the chief point is *this*: We have such a high priest, who sat down on the

¹ Or, *Now to sum up what we are saying: We have &c.*

² Gr. *upon*.

a sacrifice. (I do not mean that those priests have nothing to do with heavenly things, but it is only in a shadowy imitation of the spiritual realities that they perform their unreal ritual. Imitation; that is the gist of the oracle announced to Moses when he was to inaugurate the ceremonial of the tabernacle. See, says the divine voice, that thou do everything in imitation of the pattern shewn to thee in the mount.) But our High Priest has succeeded to an office different in kind from theirs. Indeed the analogy as applied to Him gets its peculiar distinction by reason of the covenant which it implies. The covenant which our High Priest establishes between God and man is a better one than that which Moses mediated. It is a covenant that has, on the basis of larger promises, become the gospel law. Scripture justifies our calling it "better." For if no fault could have been found with the Mosaic covenant, there would be no looking for a second to take its place. But we see just such a searching of faith in one who was—in a time of trial like the present—carried beyond the external guarantees of religion. For there is a divine oracle in the book of Jeremiah which does find fault with people, and says,

Behold days are coming, saith the LORD, when I will bring My sacred relationship towards the separated houses of Israel and Judah to completion in a new covenant. It shall go deeper than the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt. For, according to the divine sanction of that covenant, as they did not abide by My good purpose toward them, so I ceased to be careful on their behalf. For this is the covenant which I will grant to the house of united Israel, now that those days have passed away; again establishing it with My "thus saith the LORD." I will give them an affectionate understanding of My laws, and upon their hearts will I write them. So, with mutual trust, I renew the essential bond between us: "I will be to them God, they shall be to me My people." Brothers and fellow-citizens as they shall now be, they will not have to teach one another, saying, Know the LORD. For they shall all know Me in their own consciences, young and old, the great men and the simple alike. For with mercy will I now meet the ingratitude of their offences, and their sins will I never remember any more.

A new covenant! The first He declares outworn. That which is wearing out and growing old is nigh unto vanishing away.

1. *the chief point*] *Capitulum* lat. verss. = the capital point; if an argument is well knit its capital point is also the "sum" of it

right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of ¹the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, ²which the Lord pitched, not man. For every high priest ³is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is necessary that this *high priest* also have somewhat to offer. Now if he were on earth, he would not be a priest ⁴at all, seeing there are those who offer the gifts according

¹ Or, *holy things*

(see margin). Here the capital point is that the High Priest of the Christian faith has entered the real presence of God; His work is a spiritual reality. The author still expresses this by visible imagery, taken from Scripture, and as it were etherealised by a few touches; cf. Ps. cx. as in i. 3, Ex. xxix. 30, and Num. xxiv. 6. For "true" the antithesis of "made with hands" cf. ix. 24.

the sanctuary] A neuter plural of the adj. "holy" in Greek. Hence the alternative in marg. "holy things"; cf. note on x. 1.

2. *the true tabernacle*, &c.] There is a verbal reference here to Num. xxiv. 6, but the underlying thought is of Ex. xxiv. 18—xxv. 40. And by the epithet "true" the author colours the simplicity of the Hebrew story of the pattern on the mount with a philosophic tinge. As in ix. 24 we seem to catch a glimpse of Plato's "intelligible" world. The epithet applies also to "the sanctuary." The great High Priest exercises His function in a reality which transcends our images of thought. For "minister," i.e. "liturgic" minister, cf. i. 7; Rom. xiii. 6, xv. 16; Phil. ii. 25. The word is used both of civil and of sacred officers; to ancient thought all the service of the state was sacred and Godward. In Rom. xv. 16 Paul associates the word with priestly phraseology, in Phil. ii. 25 with civil.

4. *Now*] So the good mss., though the mass of mss. have "for." The particle (elsewhere translated "therefore" or "then") is used here in the "looser way to resume or continue."

To what point of time is the reference in "it is necessary, &c."? Are we to translate, "it is necessary...if he were...he would not be" (so lat. verss. and R. and A.V.), or, "it was necessary...if he had been...he would not have been"? The first might perhaps be defended by vii. 25, and the tense of "to make propitiation," ii. 17, as an allusion to continual intercession. But that would involve a strange use of the verb "to offer" (cf. note on vii. 27), and if we ask what the author meant by the "somewhat to offer," it is difficult to answer otherwise than in the words of ix. 14. The second translation must therefore be accepted, at least for "it was necessary." The conditional clause is less definite; but its point is that, but for His passing through death to the eternal sphere, the spiritual priesthood of the Lord would have been impossible. So

5 to the law; who serve *that which* is a copy and shadow of the heavenly things, even as Moses is warned of *God* when he is about to ¹make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern that 6 was shewed thee in the mount. But now hath he obtained a ministry the more excellent, by how much also he is the mediator of a better ²covenant, which hath been enacted 7 upon better promises. For if that first *covenant* had been faultless, then would no place have been sought for a 8 second. For finding fault with them, he saith,

¹ Or, *complete*

² Or, *testament*

here too the thought is carried back to the crucifixion. Thus the question whether "seeing there are those who offer, &c." proves the ep. to have been written before the fall of Jerusalem becomes superfluous. As far as the Greek construction is concerned either rendering is possible. Westcott says indeed that "the tense of the principal verb ('serve') fixes the translation of the participle to the present." But is "serve" the principal verb? It stands in a relative clause introduced by a generalising "who" or "such as."

5. *shadow*] Cf. Ps. cii. (ci.) 12, cix. (cviii.) 23, cxliv. (cxliii.) 4; Eccl. vi. 12 (vii. 1); Wisd. ii. 5, v. 9, in all of which LXX expresses the idea of a vain thing passing away. So Col. ii. 17, and in this ep. (cf. x. 1) "shadow" indicates the arbitrary, allegorical symbol, as opposed to the "image itself," or real symbol which partakes of the reality it symbolises. Intr. iii. 8.

pattern] From LXX of Ex. xxv. 40. Philo (*vit. Mos.* ii. p. 146) in his comment on the same passage makes "pattern" something like the Platonic "idea." Our author glances at that fancy (see note on v. 2 *supra*), but after all lets the word rest in the simple sense of "pattern," which was all the translator intended. He changes the tense of LXX "was shewed" from perfect to aorist because perfects, frequent as they are in the ep., are never employed without a particular reason; cf. xi. 17, xii. 2, Intr. iv. 2.

6. *ministry ... covenant ... enacted upon ... promises*] A striking sequence, leading swiftly to the doctrine of the new covenant which will be introduced at v. 8 by the quotation from Jeremiah. "Enacted" or "laid down as law" is almost paradoxical like "a different law...against the law of my mind," Rom. vii. 23, since in vii. 16 *supra* we have been carried beyond "law." Such paradoxes may be reduced to order by reference to Jas. i. 25.

8. *finding fault with them, he saith*] Or perhaps "finding fault he saith to them." This phrase of introduction is made as vague as possible. The subject is best understood from iii. 7, iv. 7, but the

tense of "saith" is the noticeable point. The inauguration of the promised new covenant now, "at the end of these days," is in the author's mind; the original occasion of the prophecy is of secondary importance to him.

Yet it is of some importance. He has chosen his quotation carefully. It is from Jer. xxxi. (xxxviii.) 31—34. Whether those critics are possibly right who think the passage does not come from Jeremiah himself, hardly matters; inspiration, not authorship, is what the writer of Hebrews cares about. And indeed it seems more characteristic of Jeremiah than the prophecies of restoration which immediately precede it. The material symbolism of those prophecies is not what Jeremiah specially stands for in O.T.; the daring "heart-religion" of this place is. We are inclined to connect it rather with the chapter that follows it, and to think of Jeremiah imprisoned as a traitor, suspected as a free-thinker in religion, certain of the speedy ruin of Jerusalem, and the abolition of all the ancient institutions of the faith. In these straits he is lifted to such a pure conception of spiritual and therefore "indissoluble" communion with God, as might be considered the culmination of O.T. prophecy. He calls this a "new covenant." But the terms of the covenant are the same as they always have been and will be, "I will be their God, and they shall be my people." It is new because it shall now be written on the heart, instead of in law, priesthood, monarchy, temple, sacrifice. Moreover, thus inwardly and spiritually written, it shall at last be effectual; it shall bring "knowledge of God" to "perfection," and supersede "merit" by "grace"; cf. John i. 17.

The idea of this new covenant inspired the author of the "Comfort ye" prophecy (Is. xl. ff.). The very phrase is recorded by S. Paul and in one version of the gospel narrative as having been uttered by our Lord at the last supper, 1 Cor. xi. 25; Luke xxii. 20. In Mark (xiv. 24 f.) the two words are spoken, but the "new" has rather a different significance: "This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God."

The author of Hebrews probably knew 1 Corinthians. He knew the tradition of the Lord's words which lies behind the gospels. He saw the covenant developing in one unbroken line from Abraham, through Moses and Jeremiah, to the last supper. At the last supper the new covenant, promised by Jeremiah, received a fresh sanction in the Saviour's blood (cf. ix. 15—17) and a final promise of fulfilment when the Lord Jesus came as Christ with the kingdom. In the trial of his own days he believed that, in some real sense, that coming was to be. Hence he quotes Jeremiah here as a prophecy for the immediate present. The new covenant was "in a very little while" to reach perfection. Even now the obsolete ceremonial, which Jeremiah had long ago recognised as no necessity for faith, was dropping away. Intr. III. 16.

- Behold, the days come, saith the Lord,
 That I will ¹make a new ²covenant with the house of
 Israel and with the house of Judah;
 9 Not according to the ²covenant that I made with their
 fathers
 In the day that I took them by the hand to lead them
 forth out of the land of Egypt;
 For they continued not in my ²covenant,
 And I regarded them not, saith the Lord.
 10 For this is the ²covenant that ³I will make with the
 house of Israel
 After those days, saith the Lord;
 I will put my laws into their mind,
 And on their heart also will I write them:
 And I will be to them a God,
 And they shall be to me a people:
 11 And they shall not teach every man his fellow-citizen,

¹ Gr. *accomplish*.

² Or, *testament*

³ Gr. *I will covenant*.

saith the Lord] LORD in the English O.T. as always when the ineffable name stands in the Hebrew text. This was not pronounced by the Jews: we only conjecture Jahveh as the pronunciation; they said *Adonai* instead which LXX translated *Kyrios*, we LORD.

I will make] or as margin has it more literally "accomplish," seems to be the author's own substitution for "ordain" of LXX. Like a very similar verb in *v.* 5, ix. 6, it has perhaps a ritual colour, which is reflected in the language of the Greek liturgies.

9. *And I regarded them not*] The Hebrew *ba'alti* either means "although I was an husband to them," cf. Jer. iii. 14, or perhaps "and I was a master to them," which would be explained by Hosea ii. 16, "thou shalt call me Ishi, my husband, and shalt call me no more Baali, my master." The mistranslation of LXX may itself be taken in a sense not unlike Hosea's. In Ex. xix. 5 the covenant is made conditional on Israel's obedience, cf. Lev. xxvi. 14 ff., especially 40 f. The new covenant, being written on the heart, needs no such condition; it will continually be renewed by forgiveness, cf. Lev. xxvi. 44 f. This is the main teaching in Deuteronomy (see especially x. 12—xi. 1), though in some places the more rigorous doctrine of retribution is enforced, cf. iv. 24 quoted in this ep. xii. 29. The repeated "saith the Lord" (*vv.* 9, 10) represents the divine sanction, first for the old promise, with conditions, then for the new promise of grace.

10. *mind*] Cf. John xv. 15.

11. *fellow-citizen*] For this there is in LXX as in ep. a variant

And every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord:
 For all shall know me,
 From the least to the greatest of them.
 For I will be merciful to their iniquities,
 And their sins will I remember no more. 12
 In that he saith, A new *covenant*, he hath made the first 13
 old. But that which is becoming old and waxeth aged is
 nigh unto vanishing away.

reading "neighbour"; a scriptural commonplace instead of the idiomatic but free rendering of the translator.

Know...shall know] Thus Jeremiah anticipates a richer fulfilment of Hosea's desire, Hos. vi. 3. To both these prophets, as to S. John, to know God is eternal life.

13. *hath made...old*] Perf. corresponding to pres. "saith" in *v.* 8. It also frames the picture which is carried vividly through the "imperfect" participles to the sudden close in "vanishing away" (frequent in LXX of Jeremiah for sudden violent removal)—"A certain moment calls the glory from the grey."

CH. IX. 1—10. THE PARABLE OF THE TABERNACLE.

Now the ordinances of the first covenant were ritualistic and its holiness was materially conceived. A tabernacle was constructed after the fashion of a double tent. In the first tent are placed the candlestick and the table and on the table the rite of setting forth the loaves before the LORD is celebrated. This tent is called "Holy place." Then beyond the inner veil is a second tent which is called "Holy of holies," the ritual of which is mainly connected with the altar of incense and the ark of the covenant; the altar is golden and the ark all covered with gold. In this tent the pot, also golden, containing the manna is kept; also the rod of Aaron which budded, and the tablets on which the "words" of the covenant at Sinai were written. Above the ark are the cherubim, the angels of the LORD's presence, overshadowing the mercy-seat with their wings. Everywhere pomp and glory of which it is not possible to speak now in detail.

That is the tabernacle and its furniture as we see it in the sacred books. And this is the divine service of the tabernacle. The outer tent is entered continually by the priests as they perform their various ministries. But the great ceremony takes place within the inner shrine. Once and once only in the year, by himself alone, the high priest enters there. He carries blood. Blood is life, and on this great occasion no less significant a sacrificial act is admissible. He offers the blood, bringing it to the LORD at the mercy-seat where He has promised to be present; a living soul for the renewal of his own soul and for cleansing the LORD's people from those

9 Now even the first *covenant* had ordinances of divine
 2 service, and its sanctuary, *a sanctuary* of this world. For
 there was a tabernacle prepared, the first, wherein ¹*were*
 the candlestick, and the table, and ²the shewbread; which
 3 is called the Holy place. And after the second veil, the
 4 tabernacle which is called the Holy of holies; having a
 golden ³censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round

¹ Or, are

² Gr. *the setting forth of the loaves.*

³ Or, *altar of incense*

sins of popular ignorance for which their priest is so largely responsible. Yet why should they be shut out? The Holy Spirit, through whom the written record of this institution comes to us, makes it particularly clear that the way to the inner mysteries has not yet been revealed to the common gaze; the outer tent still stands to hide it. But we are meant to recognise in this outer tent a kind of premeditation of the change in these days of ours. The gifts and sacrifices of the old order are offered duly though they cannot bring the worshipper to real communion with God. They are but part of an external system of rules about eating and drinking and various ceremonial washings. As ordinances of worship they are confined within the limits of earthly ideas. But their significance springs from their transitory claim. They have been appointed in expectation of a reformation which inaugurates a new epoch.

1. *Now*] A double particle in Greek, one word of which points forward till it gets its answering "but" in *v. 11*. There is the strong contrast, Christ with His realities. "Divine service" is rather "ritual service" according to the usage of the Greek noun. The order makes this word as well as "of this world" predicative. See paraphrase; and for "of this world" *Tit. ii. 12*.

the first] The mass of mss. add "tabernacle." But the simple adj. with its backward reference in all the good authorities shews that "the first covenant" (as in *viii. 13*) is meant.

sanctuary] This is a neuter adj. and in the singular number. The LXX uses it thus and, less often in the plural, for the outer tent, the "Holy place." But in this ep. the plural is always used in that sense as at end of next verse. Is not this singular a neuter abstract = "its holiness"? See paraphrase.

For the construction and furniture of the tabernacle see *Ex. xxv.—xxvii., xxx. 1—10, xxxvi.—xl*. But some details in the ep. are taken from other places in O.T.; cf. especially *Lev. xvi*.

2. *the shewbread*] From the marginal rendering we see how the author has improved the Hebraistic phrase of LXX into something more like Greek. See paraphrase.

3. *the second veil*] See *Ex. xxvii. 16*.

4. *censer*] So Aquila, Symmachus, Philo, Josephus, for the "altar of incense" of LXX. But they and our author probably

about with gold, wherein ¹*was* a golden pot holding the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and above it cherubim of glory overshadowing ²the mercy-seat; of which things we cannot now speak severally. Now these things having been thus prepared, the priests go in continually into the first

¹ Or, is

² Gr. *the propitiatory*.

mean that altar. It was outside the veil. But when Aaron entered the Holy of holies the cloud of incense penetrated to the mercy-seat. Hence in Lev. xvi. 12 f. it is "before the LORD," and is here said to "belong to" the Holy of holies.

a golden pot] Ex. xvi. 33; *Aaron's rod*, Num. xvii. 10; *the tables*, Ex. xxv. 16; Deut. xxxi. 26; 1 Kings viii. 9. The manna and the rod are not mentioned in 1 Kings viii. Josephus, *Bell.* v. 5. 5, says "No thing at all was therein. It was closed to foot and touch and sight of all and was called 'Holy of holies.'" Cf. Tac. *H.* v. 9, *vacuam sedem et inania arcana*, "a throne unoccupied and immaterial mysteries." But the ep. refers to the tabernacle in the wilderness, not to the temple and the later state of things.

5. *cherubim of glory*] A phrase formed by the author after the fashion of those Hebrew compounds in which the second noun concentrates attention upon the characteristic feature of the first, cf. Moulton¹, pp. 73 f. So Gen. i. 21, "bird of wing" (cf. Ps. lxxviii. 13, where we should say "as a dove" in English). Here the glory is the presence of the LORD, Ex. xxv. 22; Num. vii. 89; Ez. xi. 22 f., xliii. 1—4. In tabernacle and builded temple the LORD "speaketh from between the cherubim," and "above him stand the seraphim," Is. vi. 2. In the temple of the universe (cf. Ps. xxix. 9), a more ancient conception, He dwells in the "thick darkness" of the storm, 1 Kings viii. 12; rides upon the cherubim, the angels of the wind; the seraphim, angels of fire and lightning, go before Him, Ps. xviii. 6—14, cf. *supr.* i. 7; the thunder is His voice, Ps. xviii. 13; Ex. xix. 19; Deut. iv. 12; cf. *infr.* xii. 19. For a beautiful refinement upon the ritual conception see Ps. xxii. 3.

of which...severally] No doubt this simply means "I have no time or space to dwell on further details." Yet this earnest haste of the author does itself distinguish him from the allegorical school in which he had received some instruction, and with which (as he seems to acknowledge in v. 11) he had a certain sympathy. He refuses "to discover exact correspondences in the harmony of salvation" which in the allegorical ep. of Barnabas is considered necessary. "The writer of the Epistle...mentions the cherubim and the mercy-seat. Of these, he says, we cannot now speak particularly. Could any allegorist have resisted the temptation to speak most particularly on these subjects?" Maurice.

¹ *Grammar of New Testament Greek.*

7 tabernacle, accomplishing the services; but into the second the high priest alone, once in the year, not without blood, which he offereth for himself, and for the ¹errors of
 8 the people: the Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest, while
 9 as the first tabernacle is yet standing; which is a parable for the time *now* present; according to which are offered both gifts and sacrifices that cannot, as touching the
 10 conscience, make the worshipper perfect, *being* only (with meats and drinks and divers washings) carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation.

¹ Gr. *ignorances*.

6 f. For the entrance of the priests, the sons of Aaron, see Ex. xxviii. 1; Num. xvi. 40, xviii. 3—7. For the yearly entrance of Aaron (the "high priest" is hardly mentioned in the "Law") see Lev. xvi. and Ex. xxx. 10.

7. *not without blood*] Cf. Lev. xvi. 14 ff., 18 f., with Lev. xvii. 11; Intr. III. 12, 13.

errors] or (marg.) "ignorances"; cf. v. 2 above, and Ez. xlv. 20; Lev. iv. 2, 22, 27, and especially LXX of 13 "even involuntarily." Perhaps accidental uncleannesses rather than what we should call sins are primarily meant by this word. But v. 2 shews that our author has a deeper thought, and Lev. xvi. 16 justifies it.

8. Here, and in ix. 25, x. 19, xiii. 11, "the holy place" (neuter plural) seems="Holy of holies." It is more likely that this reflects the usage of Lev. xvi. There after the full phrase, "into 'the holy' within the veil in front of the mercy-seat which is upon the ark of witness," the brief phrase "the holy" is used inclusively of the whole tabernacle.

9. *are offered*] like the perfect "hath...been made manifest" is in accord with the author's habit of beholding pictures in the sacred records, standing as present things before his eyes: Intr. iv. 1. Thus again (cf. viii. 4), no inference can be drawn from this passage as to the date of the ep.

10. *washings*] Cf. vi. 2; *carnal*, cf. ii. 14, v. 7 and contrast vi. 1 "dead works" which does not refer to ritual.

carnal ordinances] This bare nominative, without "and," is the well attested reading. It stands in apposition to "gifts and sacrifices," summing up all the golden pomp of the tabernacle ritual in one candid phrase of regret and hope.

reformation] A medical word, used by Aristotle and later writers in moral sense as here. Cf. Acts iii. 21. The next verse shews that in one sense this "reformation" has already come. The primitive and popular faith of the Church would look for it in the "day of

But Christ having come a high priest of¹ the good things ¹¹ to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle,

¹ Some ancient authorities read *the good things that are come*.

the Lord" (cf. x. 25; Apoc. i. 10), the great Advent still expected. In this ep. a "critical moment"¹ is expected "to-day," in which "reformation," "new covenant," entrance into heaven (x. 19 ff.), receiving of the kingdom (xii. 28), peace in union with the will of God (x. 10, xiii. 21) may be realised by the readers for whose encouragement in stress of trial their friend is writing.

11—14. THE REALITY OF LIFE LAID DOWN TO CLEANSE.

Such is the tabernacle of the Old Covenant and its ritual, splendid, making no mean appeal to religious emotion, but unfit to fulfil that new life for which conscience yearns.

But when, Levi fading, Christ came, as High Priest of the loving mercies of God the only good, which found expression through the tabernacle that has sought to do with ritual splendour or precision, the tabernacle not made with hands, not of this ordinary earthly building; then He cared no more about the figurative blood of beasts than about the pomp of worship, but entered by the sacramental virtue of His own blood, once for all, into the sanctuary: having found, when all seemed lost upon the cross, such deliverance for men as can be measured by no temporal standard, nor rendered ineffectual by any limitations of material circumstance. It is a moral deliverance. Let it be acknowledged that the ritual observances do effect such cleansing as the use and wont of mere humanity demands. Here there is more than that; the "other world" breaks in. Our Lord Jesus completes the long line of the Christs of history with all their filial yearnings towards the Father. He died willingly, lovingly, and His life thus consecrated really became what the Levitical theology defined "blood" to be, viz. life set free for the renewing of lives. As Aaron approached the mercy-seat enveloped in the cloud of incense, so the dear memory of our dying Lord is interfused with the mystery of the all-embracing Spirit who makes all life by His inspiration eternal and divine. So, an immaculate victim, He offered himself to God. Such goodness is more intelligible than any analogy. It is our consciousness of God, who is above and through and in us all, that He died to restore, cleansing away the evil which is death to hide; so that, sharing in what He has made priestly service mean, we too may serve God who lives indeed.

11. *the good things to come*] But "the good things that are come" (margin) is the reading which must be accepted. Doubtless

¹ Such is the significance of the Greek word here translated "time": see Trench, *New Testament Synonyms*, § LVII.

not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation,
 12 nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through
 his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place,
 13 having obtained eternal redemption. For if the blood of
 goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them

the group of authorities, mss. versions and fathers, against it is strong, and W.H. give "to come" a place in their margin. But the group W.H. follow in their text may reasonably be interpreted as a consensus of all three ancient lines of transmission. And this is one of the few passages in which intrinsic probability is important in itself. As Rendall has pointed out, the construction is "that are come through the greater and more perfect tabernacle." We must delete the full stop in R.V. margin, and make a slight correction in the wording of v. 12—"did not enter through the blood of goats and calves but, &c." This is quite legitimate. The particle translated "nor yet" means "not even" or "not either" but English idiom is here satisfied by a simple emphatic "not." Even Westcott however, who translates "good things realised," has missed this piece of rather distinguished idiom. That missed, the correction "to come" would be obvious: cf. ii. 5, vi. 5, x. 1, xiii. 14. Nor did the difficulty arise entirely from the construction. Even with the right construing, the "good things" are said to have come already into being, and such sayings in N.T. have always proved hard: cf. Acts xv. 11, where A.V. and R.V. "we believe that we shall be saved" is possible grammatically but improbable in the context.

good] *agathos*, which is found only here and x. 1 in true text of this ep. The two words commonly used in it express the ideas of "nobility" and "superiority." From such passages as Mark x. 18; Luke xxiii. 50; Acts xi. 24; Rom. v. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 20, *agathos* would seem to imply goodness in the divine degree, which is goodness touched with affection.

creation] So the Latin. But the cognate verb is commonly applied to a city (3 Esdr. iv. 53) or to the tabernacle itself (Lev. xvi. 16). A.V. "building" does very well.

12. *having obtained eternal redemption*] Literally "having found." For *aeonian*, "in the eternal sphere," see note on v. 10. This is the only place in the ep. where the simple uncompounded Greek word for "redemption" or "redeem" occurs. In ix. 15, xi. 35 we find the longer Pauline noun, but hardly in Pauline sense. These words are an inheritance from O.T. through LXX, especially from the latter part of Isaiah, where they are mostly renderings of some form of the Hebrew *goel* = "avenger," and then more generally "rescuing with might." So Is. lxiii. 4 ff. (LXX): "For the day of vengeance came to them, and the year of redemption is here. And I beheld, and there was no helper; and I gave heed, and no

that have been defiled, sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse ¹ your conscience from dead works to

¹ Many ancient authorities read *our*.

one was ready to aid. And my arm rescued them, and my wrath swooped down." In Mark x. 45 = Matt. xx. 28 our Lord says that the Son of man came to be a servant and to give His life "a ransom for many," which may shew that to Jewish ears these words implied "ransom" or "price." Yet that saying too is part of the Isaianic language of deliverance: "I have given Egypt as thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee...I have loved thee; therefore will I give men for thee, and peoples for thy life," Is. xliii. 3 f. The mystery seems deeper when coordinated with John xv. 13, than when explained in terms of law or commerce. On the whole we may consider that the main idea in our author's mind is "deliverance" raised to sublimity by divine self-sacrifice. And this deliverance the Saviour "found." In the divine will it already was; not to be bought with a price, but an "ideal" which has now been realised in obedience, cf. v. 8. The aor. part. might be described as "of coincident action" but it might also be said to represent the moment before "entered in" just as "made perfect," "named" in v. 9 represent the moment after.

14. *the blood of Christ*] Intr. III. 12, 13.

eternal Spirit] There is an ancient variant "holy," but the attestation of "eternal" is sufficient, and it suits the context. The thrice-repeated "eternal" (cf. vv. 12, 15) is set over against the "gold and glory" of the tabernacle. For the vast theological idea see Intr. III. 13, 29. "The Christ" offered himself through the medium of that divine, essential life in which the whole spiritual movement issues from and returns to God—"When that which drew from out the boundless deep, Turns again home."

cleanse] Cf. ii. 17. In the middle of this word Codex B is mutilated, and fails us for the rest of the ep.

conscience] A Pauline word; five times in this ep., cf. ix. 9, x. 2, 22, xiii. 18. Rom. ii. 15 shews conscience in its troubled, 1 Pet. ii. 19 in its cleansed and truly natural state, viz. the enjoyment of the presence of God. This state is perhaps less often remembered than the other. Hence a later reading in 1 Pet. ii. 19, "good conscience" and R.V. as well as A.V. renders "conscience toward God," relegating "of God" to mg.: the meaning rather is that because of his "consciousness of God," in communion with whom he is supported and at peace, a man can well bear injuries and injustice. The word has passed from this ep. into the Greek liturgies, wherein, as here, it lifts the mind to reality, and determines the true moral sense of such ritual terms as "undefiled."

15 serve the living God? And for this cause he is the mediator of a new ¹covenant, that a death having taken

¹ The Greek word here used signifies both *covenant* and *testament*.

The whole passage, culminating in "the living God," is artistically ordered to that end.

your] *our* in margin, the attestation being strong on either side. In xiii. 21 a like variation is important; here the sense is hardly affected.

dead works] Cf. vi. 1 and Sirach xviii. 29 (omitted in mss. followed by R.V.) "Better is boldness in the only master than with dead heart to hold to dead things."

15—22. TO LIFE THAT RENEWS LIFE DEATH IS THE ONLY WAY.

And this life-renewing life can only be through death. That is why in the new covenant Christ is a mediator between God who makes the covenant and men with whom God makes it. God dies not; but in Christ the mystery of life through death has been enacted. So the divine purpose is achieved. From the transgressions, by which (as we are told in Jeremiah) the first covenant was marred, deliverance has been and is still effected. So those who have heard the call of God to-day may recognise in their clean conscience the fulfilment of the promise; the inheritance long waited for is theirs to take; the eternal inheritance of spiritual freedom.

The analogy of ancient custom points to the same truth. Where there is a covenant, the death of him who makes it has to be represented. For the ritual of a covenant is that it must be confirmed over slain victims; since the idea is that it avails not so long as he who made the agreement lives.

Hence the first covenant too is recorded to have been inaugurated not without blood. For when each commandment had been spoken, in its proper place in the law which God gave at Sinai, by Moses to the people, Moses took the blood of the calves and the goats with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book of the covenant and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the covenant which God ordained to establish his relationship with you. And, to speak generally, it is in the touch of blood that all things are cleansed according to that law, and without bloodshedding there is no remission of legal offences.

15. *covenant*] Cf. vii. 22, viii. 8. For the question whether the author passes here from the meaning "covenant" to the meaning "testament" see Intr. III. 16. Comparison with Gal. iii. 15 ff. makes for "testament." On the other hand the original Greek suits "covenant" better than appears in the English version, as R.V. margin partly shews. The Greek "be brought" might mean

place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first ¹covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance. For where ¹⁶a ¹testament is, there must of necessity ²be the death of him that made it. For a ¹testament is of force ³where ¹⁷there hath been death: ⁴for doth it ever avail while he that made it liveth? Wherefore even the first *covenant* ¹⁸hath not been dedicated without blood. For when every ¹⁹commandment had been spoken by Moses unto all the people according to the law, he took the blood of the calves and the goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the ¹covenant which God ²⁰commanded to you-ward. Moreover the tabernacle and ²¹all the vessels of the ministry he sprinkled in like manner with the blood. And according to the law, I may almost ²²

¹ The Greek word here used signifies both *covenant* and *testament*.

² Gr. *be brought*.

³ Gr. *over the dead*.

⁴ Or, *for it doth never...liveth*.

“be represented.” The Greek “over the dead” might mean “over sacrificial victims,” for which see Gen. xv.; Ex. xxiv. 7, 8; Ps. l. 5, and Jer. xxxiv. 18. And in *v.* 17 the Greek negative or interrogative particle might come under the grammarian’s heading “cautious assertion” and be rendered “The idea is that it doth not avail, &c.” Our Lord’s inauguration of the new covenant at the last supper seems to dominate the thought and the language here. That is the main reason for refusing to recognise a passage from “covenant” to “testament.” However the point may be left doubtful. It is the sacrificial analogy that is affected by the alternative, not the deeper sense, viz. that our Lord laid down His life for His friends, and that in no other way might the great salvation be perfected.

19. See Ex. xxiv. 6—8, to which details are here added from Lev. xiv. 4—7; Num. xix. 6, 17 f. So in *v.* 21 the sprinkling of “all the vessels of the ministry” comes from the “law of Moses,” not from the particular narrative of the inauguration of the covenant.

The phrase “scarlet wool,” which occurs nowhere in LXX, is found in a curious compound quotation or reminiscence in Ep. Barn. vii. about the scapegoat: “and ye must all spit and smite and put the scarlet wool round its head, and so let it be driven into the wilderness.”

say, all things are cleansed with blood, and apart from shedding of blood there is no remission.

23 It was necessary therefore that the copies of the things in the heavens should be cleansed with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than

22. *shedding of blood*] Not found in LXX or profane authors. It is a general word which includes the "shedding" as the necessary and terrible preliminary to the "sprinkling": cf. Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24; Luke xxii. 20. This would suggest the thought of the "precious blood," 1 Pet. i. 19; cf. Ps. cxvi. 6.

23—28. CHRIST IN HEAVEN, OUR REFUGE AND OUR HOPE.

It is therefore necessary that if the imitations of things heavenly be cleansed by these means, the ultimate realities themselves should be cleansed by mightier than legal sacrifices. That necessity conducted Christ. For He entered no manufactured sanctuary, an echo of the true, but penetrated that very heart of goodness which "heaven" symbolises, to be manifested now, before the face of God, in His compassionate divinity which is the refuge of us men. Nor did He purpose either to repeat that solemn act. He was not going to offer Himself many times. The very idea of such repetition is paradoxical. There is no analogy here with the Aaronic high priest's entering the sanctuary year after year in the fiction of a blood-life not his own. If that were a true symbol, Christ must have suffered many times in the long repetition of such rites; for ritual sacrifice is as old as the world. No; it is now and only now. At this moment which sums up and sweeps into desuetude the series of the ages, for the annulling of the sin which till now has obstinately held its ground, through the sacrifice of himself, He has been seen of men and passed to God. And in as much as it is the spiritual destiny of men once to die, and after death the discernment and separation of judgement; so also He, who as the Christ shares our manhood and shall at last complete our hope, having once been taken to God that He might (like the prophetic servant of the LORD) take upon himself the sins of many, shall in the sequel, separated from that burden of sin, be seen by those who are longingly expecting Him. And that vision shall be rescue from all ill.

23. *better sacrifices*] For the pl. cf. xiii. 16, but the reference can hardly be the same. The pl. here is merely the antithesis, in a general statement, to "these"; in the particular application which immediately follows, the sacrifice by which the realities of heaven are cleansed is shewn to be one and only one.

The cleansing of the heavenly realities might also be explained as a mere extension of the Levitical analogy. But from xii. 26 f.

these. For Christ entered not into a holy place made with 24
hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself,
now to appear before the face of God for us: nor yet that 25
he should offer himself often; as the high priest entereth
into the holy place year by year with blood not his own;
else must he often have suffered since the foundation of 26
the world: but now once at the ¹end of the ages hath he
been manifested to put away sin ²by the sacrifice of
himself. And inasmuch as it is ³appointed unto men once 27
to die, and after this *cometh* judgement; so Christ also, 28

¹ Or, *consummation*

² Or, *by his sacrifice*.

³ Gr. *laid up for*.

more would seem to be meant. Even the things of heaven shall be shaken. Even the saints at rest watch anxiously the issue of God's will on earth, cf. xii. 1 with xii. 23, also Apoc. v. 11 f. with vii. 16 f. In heaven itself the intercession of the High Priest is still required, vii. 25, cf. ii. 18. As yet there is no place, however near to God, where His will is not working against opposition: cf. Eph. vi. 12; Phil. ii. 10. Only within that will itself is peace, x. 10, xiii. 21. The same idea is expressed in the Lord's Prayer, at least in the Greek form in which it has come to us; "Thy will be done as in heaven also upon earth."

24. *to appear*] In LXX of manifestation of God, Ex. xxxiii. 13, 18; cf. Ps. lxxix. (lxxx.) 2; Zeph. ii. 11.

26. *have suffered*] See note on v. 8.

now] does not respond to *else* = "now as things are," for the intensive form here used indicates emphatically a point of time. Both here and in v. 24 there is a reference to that act which to men is still visible in memory ("hath been manifested," cf. Gal. iii. 1) as the crucifixion, while in eternity beyond the veil it was the manifestation of the consummated work of redemption (cf. v. 12). The "now," v. 24, is not quite logically appropriate. But "To-day" rings too insistently in the author's ear for him to heed that. Moreover there is a sense in which loyal following of Christ brings the completed sacrifice "again" into present time, cf. xiii. 13; Intr. III. 21.

end] or "consummation" (marg.). Five times in Matthew (not elsewhere in N.T.) with the genitive "of the *aeon*" or "age"; where, as in Dan. ix. 27, xii. 4, 13, it looks forward to the Messianic "end." Here it is rather different; the final age, in the successive periods of history, had been reached when the Lord died. Cf. i. 2, xi. 3.

27. *and after this cometh judgement*] Cf. Box, *The Ezra-Apocalypse*, pp. xlv f. "While the theology of S (that part of

having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for him, unto salvation.

2 Esdras which Mr Box calls the 'Salathiel-apocalypse') recognises the Day of Judgement and an intermediate state for the soul between death and judgement, it knows of no resurrection of the body. In the description of the state of the soul after death it is made clear that the soul enters at once into a state of blessedness or the reverse....These conditions—though they will be intensified—are not to be essentially altered on the Day of Judgement itself. This practically means that judgement sets in immediately after death, and that a man's fate is virtually determined by the present life—which is the doctrine of Wisdom and of Hellenistic Judaism." S. John—and our Lord in S. John—go farther and declare that *crisis*, judgement or discernment, is wrought here and now in the days of the flesh: see John v. 22 ff., xii. 31, xvi. 8 ff. Cf. xi. 40, xii. 23, but also vi. 2, xi. 35. Intr III. 24, 25.

28. *to bear the sins of many*] From Is. liii. 12; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 24, also John i. 29. The verb is the same as is elsewhere in this ep. rendered "offer up" in sacrificial sense, but Rom. viii. 3; 2 Cor. v. 21, shew how the two meanings might run into one another.

a second time] Cf. collects for I Advent, VI Epiphany, "come again," "appear again." But that is not the usual N.T. conception, cf. Mark xiv. 61 f.; Acts i. 11 (where a few mss. add "again"); "appear a second time" i.e. "secondly" "at the next stage" simply answers to "once offered."

apart from sin] Cf. vii. 26.

to them that wait for him] Cf. Luke i. 21; but in Paul this verb is strongly Messianic, Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25; 1 Cor. i. 7; Gal. v. 5; Phil. iii. 20.

unto salvation] Cf. ii. 3. "Salvation" is the whole of which redemption, cleansing, sacrifice, &c. are parts.

CH. X. 1—18. THE WILL OF MAN UNITED TO THE WILL OF GOD THROUGH THE WILLING SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

The Levitical Law carries with it an imaginary shadow of the good things which God purposed for man, not the consubstantial symbol which is a vehicle of the realities it symbolises. So year by year the sacrifices go on in monotonous succession. Men are ever approaching God, but are unable to reach by such merely ritual means His very presence. If it were otherwise these sacrifices would have ceased, since they would have already brought about the desired result; the ritual cleansing of the worshippers would have passed once for all into spiritual cleansing, and they would no longer be let and hindered by the consciousness of sins. But it is not so. There is some good in the ritual, especially of the Day of

For the law having a shadow of the good *things* to 10

Atonement. It awakes the sense of sins year after year. But it never passes into the eternal order, for bulls' and goats' blood cannot take sins away.

Wherefore, on His entrance into the created world, One whom we know saith: "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not—a body didst thou prepare for me. In burnt-offerings and sin-offerings thou didst not take pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I am come—as in a written book my commission is recorded—to do, O God, thy will." In the first part of this quotation (which is so prophetically applicable to the Person and work of our Lord) the legal sacrifices are spoken of as quite apart from the inmost mind of God. Then follows an answer to God's appeal which has abiding validity. The consent of Christ is in real correspondence with the will of God. Remove sacrifices: then God's will is established as the source and goal of salvation. And God's will envelopes us with complete and permanent consecration, since Jesus, a man like us in the body, used these human limitations to realise His representative, inclusive Christship, and to make an offering to God through which, once for all, we are brought into God's very presence, i.e. into union with His good will.

This union of men's wills with God's will is the reality of which sacrifice is the figure. Priesthood in general is merely figurative. We see priest after priest standing up in history and offering sacrifices, all of the same fictional, ineffective kind. The sacrifices are offered, and still sins bar the entrance. But this Priest of ours offered one sacrifice for the continuous taking of sins out of the way. That was the real sacrifice of a will lost and found in God's will. And so it ensued that having offered it, He was enthroned in high collateral glory at God's right hand; whence, as from the centre of life, He henceforth directs the process which shall at last be completed by the utter defeat of the powers of evil. That end is certain; the one true sacrifice assures it, for that sacrifice has already brought perfection. And He has made those partakers of His own perfected holiness who in continual succession are called to realise their consecration in the school of life.

These reflections on the life and death of our Lord, as interpreted by the experience of our hearts, are confirmed by the witness of the Holy Spirit in Scripture. For in the promise of the new covenant already quoted from Jeremiah, forgiveness of sins is the concluding assurance—"of their sins and of their iniquities I will have no more remembrance at all." The peace of the Christian conscience answers to the promise of prophecy; and where such remission is effectual there is no place for any further offering for sin.

1. *shadow...very image*] Cf. viii. 5: *icon* here, as in Col. i. 15, iii. 10 = Gen. i. 27, indicates a true type, symbol or sacrament, in

come, not the very image of the things, ¹they can never with the same sacrifices year by year, which they offer continually, make perfect them that draw nigh. Else would they not have ceased to be offered, because the worshippers, having been once cleansed, would have had no more conscience of sins? But in those *sacrifices* there is a remembrance made of sins year by year. For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith,

¹ Some ancient authorities read *it can*.

which the visible actually partakes of the eternal reality signified. What the ep. implies throughout is here plainly said, that the Levitical rites, however they may furnish an analogy, are no "type" of the sacrifice of Christ; Intr. III. 5.

they can never, &c.] Who or what are "they"? Those apparently who offer. Such a loose way of writing is less tolerable in Greek than in English, and the marginal "it can" represents an early attempt to improve the sentence. There are other variants in the mss. all probably due to dissatisfaction with a piece of careless writing, which is not intolerable for once in a letter however carefully composed as a whole.

3. *remembrance made*] There is no word for "made" in the original, and the Greek implies an awakening of mind rather than an external making of remembrance; cf. Clem. LIII. "ye know—for remembrance therefore we write this." Here and elsewhere the author recognises a sympathetic influence in the old ceremonies which, as mere ceremonies, were shadows.

5. *when he cometh into the world*] It is not of course meant that our Lord uttered these words at His birth or when He began His ministry. Nor need we suppose that our author thought the psalm was composed as a direct prediction of our Lord in the days of His flesh. But he did consider it a prophetic psalm, which expressed, by more than mere coincidence, the very mind of his Lord. He writes the *cosmos*, "the universe of natural law," not the "inhabited earth" (ii. 5 marg.) "the society of men"; there are no limitations in nature which are not transformed to instruments of the true freedom when a will in harmony with God's will operates.

he saith] The unexpressed subject harmonises with the idea of the eternal, variously manifested Christ which pervades the ep. There is more in the quotation than a dramatic application of ancient words to the Lord's earthly circumstances; cf. 1 Pet. i. 11.

The quotation is from Ps. xl. (xxxix.). It follows LXX, transposing the last words; "to do, O God, thy will" instead of "to do thy will, O God." It is a pity our version does not shew this, for

Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not,
But a body didst thou prepare for me;
In whole burnt offerings and *sacrifices* for sin thou hadst 6
no pleasure:

Then said I, Lo, I am come 7
(In the roll of the book it is written of me)
To do thy will, O God.

Saying above, Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt 8
offerings and *sacrifices* for sin thou wouldest not, neither
hadst pleasure therein (the which are offered according to
the law), then hath he said, Lo, I am come to do thy will. 9
He taketh away the first, that he may establish the
second. ¹By which will we have been sanctified through 10

¹ Or, *In*

the emphasis on "will" is all-important. It throws into the shade another point which may be made too much of, that the LXX substitutes "body" for the Hebrew "ears." For though the author alludes to the word "body" in v. 10, the doctrine of that allusion permeates the ep., and does not depend on this quotation; and this particular word has nothing to do with the purpose for which he quotes the psalm. That purpose is to introduce the main subject of this section, Christ's union with the will of God and our union through Him in that same will.

6. *sacrifices for sin*] A compound noun representing the Hebrew word for "sin-offering"; the italics in R.V. are hardly necessary as the note on v. 1 has already shewn.

7. *roll*] Properly the *umbilicus* or horn of the rod round which the writing was rolled. But here and elsewhere in the LXX it is used for the roll itself. So we might say, "between the covers of a book." It is possible that the psalmist had no definite book in view, but meant simply, "my duty is as plain as if it were written down," cf. perhaps Ps. cxlix. 9. But Cheyne says, "To the psalmist, there was a Bible within the Bible, and the books of Deuteronomy and Jeremiah formed principal elements in its composition. 'The law within my heart' reminds us at once of Deut. vi. 6 and Jer. xv. 16, xxxi. 33."

9. *then hath he said*] "Then" is part of the quotation: the perf. "hath he said" sums up the argument emphatically, as in i. 13. What the psalmist has said of old stands confirmed by the obedience of Christ: union in the will of God is consecration and perfection.

10. *by which will*] "In" (margin) is literal and better: see paraphrase.

we have been sanctified] The perfect corresponds to "once for all." Whatever their subsequent failures, those who have entered

11 the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every ¹priest indeed standeth day by day ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can never
 12 take away sins: but he, when he had offered one sacrifice
 13 for ²sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made the footstool
 14 of his feet. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever
 15 them that are sanctified. And the Holy Ghost also beareth witness to us: for after he hath said,

¹ Some ancient authorities read *high priest*.

² Or, *sins, for ever sat down &c.*

upon the Christian allegiance are sanctified; nothing but renunciation of their "sanctification" (cf. xii. 14) cancels that. In those early perilous times, entrance upon such allegiance could seldom be anything but a sincere act of will. But the thought here is deeper than that. The security is guaranteed by the greater will of God: cf. 1 John iii. 20.

11. *priest*] This is to be read with p¹³ ND, not "high priest" (margin). That, after ix. 7. might seem inconsistent with "day by day." Indeed, the view here may extend beyond the bounds of Judaism to all the ritual priesthood of the wide world: cf. v. 5. The history of religion—the satisfying of man's heart-restlessness for God—is here presented as a consistent whole. The cross is the focus. Thither all past yearning tends; thence all new confidence proceeds. There a devotion of will is apparent which goes beyond all that even the analogy of sacrifice can picture. Yet the analogy is necessary, else language would be cold and loveless. Moreover sacrificial language brings the mystery home to the only men who will recognise the cogency of the argument of these verses, in which, considered as logic, too much is taken for granted. For in no other language can the relief of forgiveness be so movingly expressed.

take away] A vivid word—"clear away the encompassment"—cf. v. 2, and xii. 1 margin. The word is precisely appropriate to the context so charged with yearning for freedom.

13. As in ch. i. the whole circle of the Incarnation and Redemption is contemplated in this paragraph about the Will. And, as there, all closes on the oracle from Ps. cx., which tells of exaltation to the throne in heaven, and then looks on to the great Advent; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 25.

14. *hath perfected...them that are sanctified*] As perhaps in Acts ii. 47 ("...being saved"), the thought of progress in the Christian life is not excluded. But the argument of the ep. as a whole would lead us to recognise the succession of those who one after another in perpetuity are called: "for ever" here is not "eternally," cf. note on vii. 3. As there is one divine will and all wills freed in it, so

This is the ¹covenant that ²I will make with them 16
 After those days, saith the Lord;
 I will put my laws on their heart,
 And upon their mind also will I write them;

then saith he,

And their sins and their iniquities will I remember no 17
 more.

Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering 18
 for sin.

Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the 19

¹ Or, *testament*

² Gr. *I will covenant.*

there is one achieved perfection and each successive perfecting of
 men is by partaking in that one. Intro. III. 18, 21.

19—25. THE VENTURE OF FAITH.

So then, brothers, argument ended, let us clinch it by action. We are emboldened to venture upon the way into the sanctuary, spiritually united and vivified in the life-blood of Jesus. It is the way which He inaugurated for us, a way fresh-slain yet living, the way that leads through the veil into the inner shrine. But such figurative language obscures the heart-touching reality—it is the way of His flesh, the mystery of His union with us in the affections of suffering manhood. And He who is the way is also the priest, the great priest prophetically descried, who mediates as elder brother over the family of God. Let us then draw near with genuine affection in the full assurance which faith gives of spiritual truth. Our ritual is complete; and it is a ritual in which the eternal pervades and overflows the visible. We are sprinkled, and at the touch of the blood of life each heart has been purged of the consciousness of its own evil. The body too has been bathed for its sojourn here with water of sacramental purity. Let us hold fast the confession of our hope, so that what we professed at baptism may not swerve in trial; nor shall it, for faithful is the Master to whose promise our confession answered. And let us study one another for the provocation of mutual love and emulation in noble deeds; not neglecting the closer fellowship which comes from common worship—nay, sirs, such manners are not good—but rather contributing encouragement, and so much the more as ye behold the Day drawing nearer, that Day of the Lord, on which the hope of our confession was concentrated.

19. *brethren*] As in iii. 1 exhortation is deepened by the sense of intimacy (cf. xiii. 22) and fellowship. This fellowship is also suggested by the form of the following phrase “in the blood” instead of “through” as in ix. 12; though our version misses that. So too the encouragement of united worship in v. 25.

20 holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which he
 dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil,
 21 that is to say, his flesh; and *having* a great priest over the
 22 house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in
 1fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil
 23 2conscience, and our body washed with pure water: let

¹ Or, *full assurance*

² Or, *conscience: and having our body washed with pure water, let us hold fast*

20. *that is to say, his flesh*] The Greek liturgies and almost all readers of the ep. understand this to refer to "the veil":

Only this veyle which thou hast broke
 And must be broken yet in me,
 This veyle I say is all the cloke
 And cloud which shadows me from thee.

H. VAUGHAN, *Cockcrowling*.

But Westcott, after considering all the legitimate senses which such an expression might bear, says, "it remains surprising that 'the flesh' of Christ should be treated in any way as a veil, an obstacle, to the vision of God in a place where stress is laid on His humanity." He therefore prefers, with Tyndale, Coverdale, the Great Bible and the Geneva Bible, to take "of his flesh" as gen. after "the way" rather than as in apposition to "the veil" (which is also a genitive in the Greek): "By the new and living way which he hath prepared for us through the veil, that is to say by his flesh." Such emphatic final genitives are not uncommon; see e.g. xii. 11; Acts iv. 33; James ii. 1, and Luke ii. 14, where Origen considered that "of good will" might be construed with "peace." Moreover the repetition "way in...way" (lost in English) and the peculiar epithet "new" (which may have been supposed by the author, as by early grammarians, to mean properly "fresh-slain") in antithesis to "living," combine to keep the idea of "way" prominent throughout the sentence. The "common-sense" of readers is against this, and it is possible that Westcott, with the more exact expressions of S. John in his mind, has been needlessly offended by a verbal inconsistency in this author, who strikes out a first sketch of the sacramental language elaborated by S. John. That is possible but improbable; the subtle nicety of the author's phraseology and the sanity of Westcott's judgement grow upon the patient reader: *Intr.* III. 15.

21. *a great priest...of God*] A reference, as in iii. 1, to Num. xii., but combined with the deep theology of Zech. vi. 11 ff.

22. *from an evil conscience*] The prep. is recognised as natural when it is remembered that "conscience" has not yet taken the definite modern sense: it is still a state rather than a part of mind.

washed] Washing the body is a natural symbol of inner washing,

us hold fast the confession of our hope that it waver not; for he is faithful that promised: and let us consider one 24

as has probably been always felt; cf. Aesch. fr. 32, "with body washed in fair waters I came to towering Himera." But no doubt there is an allusion here to baptism, which throughout Acts and Epistles fills so much of the background. Almost exactly the same word with a like veiled allusion is used in John xiii. 10. In the whole sentence, we have an example of what Bengel rather loosely calls "chiasmus," and says is the characteristic figure of the epistle. "Draw near," "sprinkled," "body," "water," are the more metaphorical or visual terms; "hearts," "conscience," "washed," "pure," touch the spirit more directly. The antithetical weaving of the sentence draws the attention inward and onward to the unseen: "Let us draw near, but to the unseen shrine of faith; let us use ritual, but the simplest, the most cleansing; let us rejoice in our baptism, but remembering that baptism is the appeal or conscience to God," cf. 1 Pet. iii. 21; 1 John iii. 19 f. We might say that the washing is general symbolism, but the associated thought of baptism gives further point as in Shakespeare, *H. V.*, i. 2, "That what you speak is in your conscience wash'd As pure as sin with baptism." It is possible to imagine another connexion between these two clauses, viz. that while "washed" points to baptism, "sprinkled" points to the chalice of the Blood of Christ. The reader must consider whether or no such interpretation fits the whole context of the epistle; Intr. II. 4, III. 21. For the ritual and moral significance of "sprinkled" see Hort's thorough and profound examination into the sense of "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ," 1 Pet. i. 2. He shews that "The sprinkling of blood on the altar is represented by the sacrifice of the Cross...the virtue of which proceeded from nothing cognisable by the outward senses, but from the inner yielding up of the very life for the sake of men at the Father's will"; that "Obedience was the form of moral good which the preparatory dispensation of law could best teach. Under the higher dispensation of grace it lost none of its necessity: the sprinkled blood enlarged its scope, while it filled it with a new spirit and sustained it with a new power"; and that to S. Peter and the seer of the Apocalypse "The blood of martyrdom was in some sense comprehended in 'the blood of the Lamb,' of Him who is called 'the faithful Witness,' or Martyr."

The punctuation might be made after "conscience" (margin). But apart from the considerations touched upon above, the abrupt commencement "let us hold fast" is quite in the manner of our author.

23. *hope*] "Faith" of A.V. was not found in earlier versions and is without authority. The mistake has affected A.V. heading. The slip was easy: in cod. armachanus of vg. *fidei* was written and afterwards corrected to *spei* in vi. 11.

25 another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the custom of some is, but exhorting *one another*; and so much the more, as ye see the day drawing nigh.

26 For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more a

24. *to provoke unto love*] Such paradoxes are not unfrequent in N.T.; cf. Mark iii. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 11 (R.V. marg.); also Clem. R. LVIII. and LXII. "intense moderation."

25. *the assembling of ourselves together*] The Greek is the noun "synagogue" compounded with a preposition. In 2 Thess. ii. 1 it is used of joining Christ in the day of His coming. And here, as in that picture of early church life "The teaching of the Apostles," ch. xvi., gathering for worship is connected with that hope. The common worship is preparation for, even a sacrament of, the gathering together of all in Christ. And this the more evidently because here Christ's immediate coming in the crisis of the time is especially in view.

26—31. IN GOSPEL TRUTH NO SUBTERFUGE FOR SIN.

Away with fastidious hesitation; the coming trial is of tremendous import. For there is no more question of sins of inadvertence as in the old Law; nay the whole of that old Law with its technical sin-offerings is gone by. If we now persist in wilful sin after receiving the knowledge which discerns real instead of conventional truth, nought remains but an expectation of judgement, the more fearful for our incapacity of defining it in terms of human imagination—it is what the prophet meant when he told how God had predestined "a fierce jealousy of fire to eat up his adversaries." Do not be adversaries of God. When a man has set Moses' Law at nought, he is out of reach of all human pity; "on the evidence of two or three witnesses," we read, "he dies." How much worse, think ye, shall be the estimate of his penalty who shall have trampled on the Son of God, and accounted as a vile thing the Blood of the Covenant in which he received his consecration to our Lord's service, and shall have insolently used the Spirit who breathes God's grace? Argument is needless; we know without telling Him who said, "Judgement is mine, I will repay": and again, "The LORD will vindicate his own people." It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of God, the living One.

26. *knowledge of the truth*] Cf. John i. 17. The Greek word means knowledge, not in the abstract, but directed towards a particular object. See Robinson, *Ephesians*, pp. 248—254.

there remaineth no more, &c.] Like vi. 4 ff., xii. 17, this almost appears to contradict the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins. Yet closer examination shews that "sacrifice for sins" is an O.T. term, and that the latter half of the verse is but a repetition of v. 18.

sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of 27
judgement, and a ¹fierceness of fire which shall devour the
adversaries. A man that hath set at nought Moses' law 28
dieth without compassion on *the word of* two or three
witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall 29
he be judged worthy, who hath trodden under foot the
Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant,
wherewith he was sanctified, ²an unholy thing, and hath
done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him 30
that said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recom-

¹ Or, *jealousy*

² Gr. *a common thing*.

What does "remain" is indeed fearful. Here, as elsewhere, the ruin involved in a base choice at the crisis with which the readers are confronted is emphatically stated. Yet such ruin is too mysterious to be humanly defined: hence "a certain." As in 2 Tim. iv. 14, O.T. language is quoted (Is. xxvi. 11, LXX) to adumbrate what the author presumes not to explain. And in all such fears or threats S. Paul's principle (1 Cor. v. 5) is presupposed: Intr. III. 20, 22.

28. *dieth...witnesses*] From Deut. xvii. 6. The curious addition in some "western" texts "or tears" after "compassion," may be a modified reminiscence of a phrase in the same section of Deut. xiii. 8.

29. *the blood of the covenant*] From Ex. xxiv. as in ix. 20, but here raised to a higher power by the preceding "Son of God."

the Spirit of grace] The following reff. will shew how difficult it is for us, accustomed to the developed language of Trinitarian doctrine, to appreciate the delicate shades of meaning that attach to combinations of "Spirit" with other words in N.T., Rom. viii. 15, cf. 1 John iv. 6; 1 Cor. ii. 12; 2 Cor. iv. 13; Eph. i. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 8. But it must be remembered that a heritage of Jewish thought made the personal conception of Spirit more natural than any vague idea of influence: Intr. III. 29.

"The grace" is the gift of new life which Christians received, not merely in general, but with special intensity for meeting their several trials. The Spirit of this grace is, from one point of view, the "breath" of God who brings the grace (cf. John xx. 22 f.): from another, the breath of new life within springing from this grace.

30. *Vengeance...shall judge his people*] Quoted from Deut. xxxii. 35 f. The second sentence agrees with LXX, the former does not. But it corresponds exactly with a quotation of the same four words in Rom. xii. 19, and it represents the Hebrew fairly. Since it agrees with the Targum of Onkelos still more closely, we cannot certainly infer that the author remembered S. Paul's words when he wrote this verse, as is likely however, since the Pauline faith-text follows almost immediately in v. 37; cf. xi. 33, where there seems to be

- 31 pense. And again, The Lord shall judge his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.
- 32 But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were enlightened, ye endured a great conflict of
- 33 sufferings; partly, being made a gazingstock both by

a reminiscence, not of the LXX of Daniel, but of some version which re-appears in the later translator Theodotion. More interesting is S. Paul's purpose in quoting. He gives the words the meaning they bear in the original context: God's people may be secure, for He will judge between them and their enemies. Our author seems to give them a precisely opposite meaning. Yet if the choice before his readers was between a false patriotism and "in quietness and confidence shall be your strength," the original intention of the sentence would presently recur to them: Intr. III. 3.

32—39. FIRST LOVE AN EDUCATION FOR THE SUPREME VENTURE OF FAITH.

And call to mind the early days when, freshly enlightened by the dayspring of the gospel, you faced like stout athletes much trial of sufferings. On the one hand you were then a spectacle to the populace by the insults and afflictions you endured; on the other hand this gave you the assurance that you had really been made comrades of the men whose chosen lot was a life like that. Your comradeship you shewed by compassion towards our brothers in prison; your own hardship you transformed by accepting the seizure of your property with joy, recognising in your new knowledge that so long as you were masters of yourselves you had a better possession than material wealth, and a possession that abides. Do not then cast off that daring mood which so became you then and is now designed to reap a plenteous harvest. For brave endurance is what the times now call for, in order that you may do the duty which God wills and then carry home what the prophets have proclaimed. For there is yet but "a very little while." He (thus we may render the dim early oracle precise to-day), He who "cometh shall come and shall not delay. And to my righteous servant life shall spring from faith." Yet there is another verse on another note: "If he shrink back my soul hath no pleasure in him." Well, as for us, we have nothing to do with shrinking back to ruin; our calling is the faith that ventures all for a life in harmony with God's over-ruling of the adverse world.

32. *were enlightened*] Cf. vi. 4. The reading of \aleph^* , "your former sins," looks like an audacious alteration, such as textual critics find in what they call the "western" type of early text, prompted by the idea of baptism; cf. Rom. v. 8.

33. *conflict...gazingstock*] The Greek words imply "in the arena and theatre" and these metaphors are so like what Clement (vi.)

reproaches and afflictions; and partly, becoming partakers with them that were so used. For ye both had compassion on them that were in bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your possessions, knowing¹ that² ye yourselves have a better possession and an abiding one. Cast not away therefore your boldness, which hath great recompense of reward. For ye have need of patience, that, having done the will of God, ye may receive the promise.

¹ Or, *that ye have your own selves for a better possession*

² Some ancient authorities read *ye have for yourselves a better possession*.

says of the martyrdoms under Nero at Rome that they seem to point to Roman Christians as the recipients of the letter. But they are bookish metaphors (cf. xii. 1 f.), and the author may possibly have S. Paul's phrase, 1 Cor. iv. 9, in mind.

34. *them that were in bonds*] The word is *desmiois* = "prisoners." An ancient variant is *desmois* = "bonds." Another is *desmois mou* = "my bonds." The first of these variants seems to have been a mere slip in writing; the second an improvement of the slip for the sake of getting sense out of the vague "bonds." Once admitted "my bonds" became an argument for Pauline authorship; cf. Phil. i. 7, 13 f., 17; Col. iv. 18; Philem. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 9; Intr. ii. 2. The parallel to the undoubtedly true reading is xiii. 3 *infra*.

ye yourselves have] But the rendering of the margin, with which cf. Luke xxi. 19, is surely right, "that ye have your own selves for a better possession." This is one of those high flights of apostolic thought which mark "inspiration." Later generations have often reduced them to commonplace, altering the text. Two such reductions may be seen here in R.V. margin and A.V. (cf. Intr. iv. 4). Once the private will has been lost and found in God's will (x. 10), the self or soul is infinite riches. The addition of "in heaven" (A.V.) imports an idea of future recompense which is quite alien to the context.

For a theological comment on the value of "self" see 2 Cor. xiii. 5, R.V.; and Maurice's pathetic explanation of this to his troubled mother (*Life*, I. ch. xi.): "...The truth is that every man is in Christ; the condemnation of every man is that he will not own the truth; he will not *act* as if this were *true*, he will not believe that which is the truth, that, except he were joined to Christ, he could not think, breathe, live a single hour.... Separate from Christ, I can bear no fruit to God. Separate from Christ, I am separate from every one of my brethren...."

And cf. the language of Themistocles after Salamis: "For we have found a great find, our own selves and Hellas, having beaten off so vast a cloud of men... 'for these deeds it is not we who wrought but the gods and heroes,'" Hdt. viii. 109.

- 37 For yet a very little while,
 He that cometh shall come, and shall not tarry.
 38 But ¹my righteous one shall live by faith:
 And if he shrink back, my soul hath no pleasure in him.
 39 But we are not ²of them that shrink back unto perdition;
 but of them that have faith unto the ³saving of the soul.

¹ Some ancient authorities read *the righteous one*.

² Gr. of *shrinking back...but of faith*. ³ Or, *gaining*

37. The quotation is from Hab. ii. 3 f., introduced by a phrase from Is. xxvi. 20, another "advent" passage. There are some slight variations from the LXX but what is important is the author's bold addition of the article to the part. "coming," by which he adapts O.T. language to the Church's expectation of the coming of Christ. In LXX "coming shall come" represents the emphatic Hebrew "shall indeed come"; who shall come, is left mysteriously vague. In the Hebrew it is "the vision" that comes. Thus Hebrew, LXX, and ep. represent three stages in Messianic thought, corresponding to the three periods to which they belong.

39. *unto the saving of the soul*] "Gaining" (margin) is better. This remarkable Greek noun (= "gaining," "obtaining," "possessing," "making one's own") is used in 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14; Eph. i. 14; Haggai ii. 9 (LXX) and 1 Pet. ii. 9, with which cf. LXX of Is. xliii. 21; Mal. iii. 17: the corresponding verb in Luke xvii. 33; Acts xx. 28; 1 Tim. iii. 13. The Dean of Wells explains Eph. i. 14 ("unto the redemption of God's own possession") from the concrete idea of LXX; "that ultimate emancipation by which God shall claim us finally as His 'peculiar treasure.'" Westcott¹ however sees a larger promise—"all that which God has made His own in earth and heaven, not men only who had fallen from Him, and earth which had shared the consequences of man's fall, but all created things, gathered together in the last crisis of their history...God in His infinite patience and love wins His creatures to Himself...The thought is of the complete fulfilment of God's purpose." This appears to suit the general character of Ephesians and the absolute use of the noun in that verse. In our passage there is a difference; this noun has changed position, and gaining the grammatical government of the phrase has lost its principality in the idea. Here the emphasis is on "soul" and the interest is in that process or crisis of life by which the "soul" reaches freedom. Compare what Hegel says about the more elementary process of soul possessing body: "A living being has a body; the soul takes possession of it and without intermediary has objectified itself in it. The human soul has much to do, before it makes its corporeal nature into a means. Man

¹ *St Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, Macmillan, 1906.

Now faith is ¹the assurance of *things* hoped for, the 11

¹ Or, *the giving substance to*

must, as it were, take possession of his body, so that it may be an instrument of his soul¹." The author desires that his friends may so truly get possession of their souls that they may become masters of the circumstances which endanger them. They are to "come to themselves"; to realise the true harmony between the ideal of the Christian calling, and the difficulties presented by the seeming, external necessity of taking a lower choice. When this friction shall be serenely accepted as the divinely fit means of destined advance (cf. "let us be borne onward," vi. 1) they will have entered upon "possession of soul," which is the happy state of faith, consequent upon the venture of faith.

CH. XI. 1—3. FAITH AND THE ETERNAL ORDER.

And, let men say what they will, there is such a power as faith. It is the heart of hope; it sifts fancy from reality when we reach into the unseen. Faith is; for in the impulse and strength of faith alone did the men of old time win their place in the roll of scripture heroes. It is by faith that we get intelligence to comprehend how the ages have been adjusted and re-adjusted by God's decree, so that we may not think that the course of history has come about from the surface play of passions and accidents.

For this description of faith see Intr. III. 33, IV. 2. Add these quotations from Windisch:

Faith is vision of the unperceived, the apostle says, and brings things unseen to as full a certainty as if they were seen...for whereas the objects of hope seem to be unsubstantial faith gives them substance: or rather gives not, but is their substance. Chrysostom t. XIII. p. 197.

Abraham is said to have been the first to have faith in God since he was the very first to grasp the conception firmly and for ever that the highest of all is the only cause of all and is the providence of the world and all that is therein. Philo, *de virt.* 216, p. 442.

Faith then towards God is the only perfectly true and surely settled good...the fulfilment of fair hopes...the education of a soul once fixed and founded on that first cause of all things who can do all things and wills to do the best. Philo, *de Abr.* 268, p. 39.

Add also Coleridge, *Aids*, Moral and Relig. Aph. xii., "in all finite quantity there is an infinite, in all measure of time an eternal; and the latter are the basis, the substance, the true and abiding reality of the former."

1. *is*] stands first in the Greek sentence, unusually and emphatically; the reality of faith rather than its definition is insisted upon. Hence the following "for" in *v.* 2.

things] Notice the italics in R.V. The Greek word is more

¹ *The Logic of Hegel*, transl. W. Wallace, § 208, cf. § 216.

² ¹proving of things not seen. For therein the elders had
³ witness borne to them. By faith we understand that the
² worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that
 what is seen hath not been made out of things which do

¹ Or, *test*

² Gr. *ages*.

concrete, "facts." Faith gives subsistence to hope, existence to invisible fact.

assurance] But the Greek is *hypostasis* "substance"; see notes on i. 3, iii. 14. *Proving*, Greek *elenchus*, is the "test" or "trial" which shews a thing as it really is. Windisch quotes from Epictetus, *Dissert.* III. 10, 11, "the *elenchus* of a matter is the philosopher's criticism." There it means the "account" which is given in answer to this trial: so Socrates in his *Apologia* (39 c) said that the Athenians would find, when he was gone, others to "try" or expose their true characters with less sympathy than he had shewn and that they vainly expected to escape "giving account." A.V. "evidence" is almost a confusion of the two senses. "Test" (R.V. marg.) seems to suit the context here.

² *had witness borne to them*] The verb is a striking one—*martyrein* cf. "martyr"—and with its cognate noun gathers deeper meaning as the argument proceeds: cf. xi. 39, note.

³ *worlds*] But see margin, cf. i. 2. The ref. is primarily to the creation, Gen. i. But with this word the author takes a wider sweep. The idea of time in *aeons*—"ages" not "worlds"—is extended into faith in the growing process of God's already perfect will, cf. x. 10. Thus moral purpose enters creation. To the first readers of the ep. their own troubled days appeared disorderly. Their friend's faith, seeing life steadily and whole, perceived the divine continuity of history.

that what is seen] Our borrowed word *phenomena* just expresses the meaning. Blass, in his *Grammar of N.T. Greek*, 75. 7, says the "not" should go with the participle, "what is seen hath been made out of things which do not appear." But it is more forcible to construe "not" with "hath been made," a perf. inf. which attracts the weight of the sentence to itself. The result of intelligent faith is the conviction that "nullity and transitoriness constitute only the superficial features and not the essence of the world¹." Blass quotes the parallel in 2 Macc. vii. 28, "I beseech thee, my child, to lift thine eyes unto the heaven and the earth, and to see all things that are therein, and thus to recognise that God made them not of things that were," or as Blass would prefer, "made them of things that were not": compare or contrast Apoc. iv. 11 (R.V.). Readers of Philo will notice how often this chapter seems to be connected with his writings. But the coincidences

¹ Hegel, *Logic*, Wallace, p. 234, cf. *supr.* i. 10 ff.

with the Maccabean books are quite as remarkable. With Philo a general community of thought and language is all that can be asserted. *Intr.* III. 32, 33.

4—16. FAITH AND THE PATRIARCHS.

“Still far beyond the range of actual touch, historical sympathy sets the individual amid a kindred of great names.” Wallace.

By faith Abel offered to God a more abundant sacrifice than Cain, and through that sacrifice he received witness of his righteousness, God himself witnessing to the rightness of his gifts; and through the sequel of the sacrifice he died and yet still speaketh.

By faith Enoch was taken away so as not to see death; he was not found, says the Scripture, for God took him. God took him because He had pleasure in him, for before he was taken the witness is recorded that “he hath pleased God.” Apart from faith it is impossible to please; for he who cometh to God’s presence must by an act of faith decide that God is, and that to those who diligently seek Him He proves a good paymaster in affection.

By faith Noah received oracular warning of events not yet in sight; he reverently heeded it, and prepared an ark for salvation, his family’s salvation. Thus he openly condemned the opinion of the vulgar world, and became heir of the righteousness which developes along the line of faith.

By faith Abraham obeyed the call, while it was yet in his ears, to go forth to a place which he was destined to receive as an inheritance; and he went not knowing whither. By faith he entered like a sojourner into a foreign land; but it was indeed the home-land where the divine promise would realise itself. He came as a sojourner vowed to the life of tents, with Isaac and Jacob who were associated with him in the succession of the same promise; a sojourner in tents, for he looked away from earth to the city that hath firm foundations, whose designer and creator is God.

By faith too Sarah herself (doubter though she seemed) was invigorated for the seed-sowing even when past the seasonable age, since she did account Him faithful that promised. And so, from one man, from a man as good as dead, were born children like the stars of the sky in multitude and as the sand on the sea-shore which is innumerable.

On the journey of faith these patriarchs all died; they did not come home with the promises, but they saw them on the far horizon and greeted them, and confessed they were strangers and pilgrims on earth. “On earth”; for those who use that form of creed make manifest their search after a native land beyond. And if they had been merely re-awakening the memory of that land from which they came forth, they would have had opportunity to retrace their steps. But now, you see, they are yearning for the better land, that is the high heavenly one. And therefore infinite

4 appear. By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, through which he had witness borne to him that he was righteous, ¹God bearing witness ²in respect of his gifts: and through it he being dead yet
5 speaketh. By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and he was not found, because God translated him: for before his translation he hath had witness borne to him that he had been well-pleasing unto God:
6 and without faith it is impossible to be well-pleasing *unto him*: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is,
7 and *that* he is a rewarder of them that seek after him. By

¹ The Greek text in this clause is somewhat uncertain.

² Or, *over his gifts*

God is not ashamed to answer to the homely title of "their God"; for He prepared, for them, a city.

4. *a more excellent*] or "abundant." A picturesque epithet which lent itself to the author's weakness for alliteration.

God bearing witness in respect of his gifts] See margin. Hort's judgement was that "the reading of the best mss. ('God himself bearing witness') is apparently a primitive error, due to mechanical permutation, the true reading being that which Clement of Alexandria alone has preserved." That reading, "God bearing witness to him," is now supported by μ^{13} . Yet Gen. iv. 4 might perhaps have justified the emphasis laid by "the best mss." on God's "own" witness. The rather awkward expression "in respect of (marg. 'over') his gifts" represents a Greek preposition which comes in as part of the quotation from LXX.

speaketh] So the true text; but the "received text" which A.V. generally follows has "is spoken of." Perhaps the influence of the Vulgate saved our A.V. from such a jejune sentiment. "Immortality! Not here in human remembrance"; cf. Phil. *Quod det pot.*, p. 200, "Abel—what a paradox—has been slain and yet lives."

5. *was translated*] *translatus est*, lat. verss. Gen. v. 24 has "And Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him," which might describe a calm and holy death. Wisd. iv. 10 is almost as reticent: a special sense is imported into the Greek for "translated": but it need mean no more than "removed." Nor is Sirach xlv. 16 different, but in xlix. 14 something miraculous is implied, "No man was created upon the earth such as was Enoch; for he was taken up from the earth." Our author, full of the one great wonder of the Person of Christ, prefers mystery to miracle, and restrains himself from speculation.

6. *rewarder*] This does not imply mercenary religion, but trust which is really personal—*respondet curis aequatque amorem*. It is

faith Noah, being warned *of God* concerning things not seen as yet, moved with godly fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; through which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is according to faith. By faith Abraham, when he was 8 called, obeyed to go out unto a place which he was to receive for an inheritance; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he became a sojourner in the 9 land of promise, as in a *land* not his own,¹ dwelling in tents, with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: for he looked for the city which hath the 10 foundations, whose ²builder and maker is God. By faith 11 even Sarah herself received power to conceive seed when she was past age, since she counted him faithful who had

¹ Or, *having taken up his abode in tents*

² Or, *architect*

one of our author's full-sounding compounds: cf. the cognate noun in *v.* 26 below.

7. *moved with godly fear*] Cf. *v.* 7, xii. 28; *metuens*, lat. verss. is inadequate; so is A.V. "moved with fear" and A.V. margin "being wary."

condemned] Cf. Luke xi. 31 f. This compound verb is rare compared with the simple form which means "to judge" in N.T. Only in Mark xvi. 16 and perhaps 2 Pet. ii. 6 is God's "condemnation" of man asserted.

the righteousness which is according to faith] The preposition is rather strange: it means "along of," "along the road of." S. Paul thinks rather of righteousness springing "out of" faith; Rom. ix. 30, x. 6; cf. Rom. iii. 22, iv. 11, 13; Phil. iii. 9.

8. For Abraham's "call" see Gen. xii. 1; from the human point of view, Gen. xi. 30 f. For his "sojourning," Gen. xxiii. 4. That thought is taken up again in *v.* 13. The stages of its spiritual development are to be observed in 1 Chr. xxix. 15 and Ps. xxxix. (xxxviii.) 12. It is the core of that "other-worldly" idealism which has always been characteristic of the Jew, appeared in utmost purity in the Galilean Gospel, and is interpreted for a rising generation in the rest of N.T. In this ep. the doctrine of faith is mainly an appeal for the revival of that enthusiasm.

9. *the land of promise*] For this gen. of essential character cf. ix. 5.

11. *since she counted him faithful*] As in *v.* 27, the author goes against the letter of O.T. (Gen. xviii. 12 ff.) to reach the general and profounder truth. For S. Paul's application of the incident cf. Rom. iv. 18 ff.

12 promised: wherefore also there sprang of one, and him as good as dead, *so many* as the stars of heaven in multitude, and as the sand, which is by the sea shore, innumerable.
 13 These all died ¹in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them and greeted them from afar, and having confessed that they were strangers and
 14 pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things make it manifest that they are seeking after a country of their
 15 own. And if indeed they had been mindful of that *country* from which they went out, they would have had
 16 opportunity to return. But now they desire a better *country*, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed of them, to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

¹ Gr. *according to*.

12. *as the stars, &c.*] From Gen. xxii. 17.

13. *in or according to faith*] = "in the way of faith," cf. v. 7. In accordance with the metaphor that follows the author pictures faith in terms of space, whereas S. Paul hardly varies from terms of energy.

having seen...and greeted...from afar] Like pilgrims who see the minarets of the city on the horizon, and still must camp for one more night in the desert. A.V. follows "received text" which inserts "and were persuaded of them" with a curious paucity of authority or sense.

16. *But now they desire*] pres., because the author, as usual, realises written history as a vivid picture. Perhaps also because these pilgrim fathers were still living and still waiting, cf. v. 40.

is not ashamed of them] Cf. Plat. *Symp.* 216 B: "I have had towards this person alone among men a feeling of which no one would suppose me capable, the feeling of being abashed before any one." The meaning is rather "is not abashed before them"—a boldly imaginative figure—than "ashamed of their conduct." Note the emphasis "them," "their," "them."

to be called] Again a compound word which almost implies "to be surnamed," cf. Ex. iii. 15. The author dissents from Philo's philosophic reverence, and follows the early historians of Israel in dwelling on this homely, "human" condescension in God.

17—31. FAITH: THE CONSECRATION AND REDEMPTION OF ISRAEL.

By faith hath Abraham fulfilled the sacrifice of Isaac, though the trial was hard: yea, the only begotten son was he in the act of offering who had accepted the promises, unto whom it was said,

By faith Abraham, being tried, ¹offered up Isaac: yea, ¹⁷ he that had gladly received the promises was offering up his only begotten son; *even he* ²to whom it was said, In ¹⁸ Isaac shall thy seed be called: accounting that God *is* able ¹⁹

¹ Gr. *hath offered up*.

² Or, *of*

In Isaac shall a seed be called for thee. For he had made up his mind that God, even from the dead, can raise to life. And from the dead indeed, by a restoration that is a symbol for later faith, he did recover him.

By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau, and his blessing reached into the purposes of God.

By faith Jacob, when he was dying, distinguished the two sons of Joseph as he blessed them; and with the reverent insight of infirm old age he worshipped leaning on the top of his staff.

By faith Joseph, as his end drew near, bade his brethren remember that the children of Israel should go forth from Egypt, and gave commandment concerning the removal of his own bones.

By faith Moses was hidden immediately after birth for three months by his parents, because they saw how goodly the child was, and they feared not the decree of the king.

By faith Moses, when he was grown a man, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, having made his choice rather to suffer abiding affliction with the people of God than to have enjoyment of sin for a season. Greater riches in his reckoning than the treasures of Egypt was the scorned estate of the Christ-bearing nation; for he looked to the eternal service in which God pays the wages.

By faith he left Egypt, but not because he feared the wrath of the king; for he strengthened his resolution, as seeing Him who is invisible.

By faith he celebrated the Passover (as Israel still does) and the ritual of blood, that the destroyer of the firstborn should not touch them.

By faith they crossed the Red Sea as by dry land. But the Egyptians had enough of sea and were swallowed up.

By faith the walls of Jericho fell after the procession had gone round them seven times in seven days.

By faith Rahab the harlot perished not with the infidels, because she had received the spies with the hospitality of peace.

¹⁷. *offered up*] From Gen. xxii., but the perf. "*hath offered up*" (margin) is in marked contrast to the aorists of that narrative. "*Sacrifice*" is a metaphor from ancient worship; the reality such language points to lies in the union of man's will with God, cf. x. 10. Thus Abraham is ever to be regarded as having in fact sacrificed Isaac, though the slaying of the boy was stayed. To our author the main argument of Gen. xxii. is the eternal consecration

to raise up, even from the dead; from whence he did also
 20 in a parable receive him back. By faith Isaac blessed
 21 Jacob and Esau, even concerning things to come. By
 faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed each of the sons
 of Joseph; and worshipped, *leaning* upon the top of his
 22 staff. By faith Joseph, when his end was nigh, made
 mention of the departure of the children of Israel; and
 23 gave commandment concerning his bones. By faith Moses,
 when he was born, was hid three months by his parents,
 because they saw he was a goodly child; and they were
 24 not afraid of the king's commandment. By faith Moses,
 when he was grown up, refused to be called the son of
 25 Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to be evil entreated
 with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin
 26 for a season; accounting the reproach of ¹Christ greater

¹ Or, *the Christ*

of the nation, through Isaac, to the LORD. Cf. the somewhat narrower application of the same thought in Ep. Barn. vii. 3, "since he too for our sins was to offer the vessel of the spirit as a sacrifice, so that the type which was formed when Isaac was offered on the altar might be fulfilled." In Clem. xxxi. Isaac himself is spoken of as a willing sacrifice, "Isaac with willing trustfulness reading the future was gladly conducted to his sacrifice."

19. *in a parable*] Cf. ix. 9; but Camerarius, in the sixteenth century, proposed to take the Greek phrase as though "in the very crisis of the hazard"; another of the bold paradoxes of the ep., but hardly possible, though a scholium on Thuc. i. 131 lends vague support to it.

20 f. See Gen. xxvii., xlviii. The last words of v. 21 are quoted from Gen. xlvii. 31, where LXX "staff" represents a different pointing of the consonants which signify "bed" in the traditional Hebrew text. Latt. render *adoravit fastigium virgae eius*: "he worshipped the top of his staff." But at least one ms. of the Vulgate inserts *super*, and our English paraphrase, "leaning upon," is legitimate. Our author certainly, and the LXX probably, had no idea of Jacob's worshipping an image carved on his staff; cf. however Gen. xxxi. 19; 1 Sam. xv. 23, xix. 13; Hos. iv. 12.

23 ff. See Ex. ii., of which these verses are verbally reminiscent, as v. 28 is of Ex. xii. 21 ff. "Born" might possibly be construed with "faith" as referring to Ex. ii. 1; his parents were careful of his pure Levitical descent.

26. *the reproach of Christ*] Better "the Christ" (margin). A reminiscence of Ps. lxxxix. (lxxxviii.) 50 f., where "thine anointed,"

riches than the treasures of Egypt: for he looked unto the recompense of reward. By faith he forsook Egypt, not 27 fearing the wrath of the king: for he endured, as seeing him who is invisible. By faith he ¹kept the passover, and 28 the sprinkling of the blood, that the destroyer of the firstborn should not touch them. By faith they passed 29 through the Red sea as by dry land: which the Egyptians assaying to do were swallowed up. By faith the walls of 30

¹ Or, *instituted* Gr. *hath made*.

or "thy Christ," means the people of Israel; Intr. III. 6, 28, and i. 5, v. 5, notes.

27. *not fearing*] This might refer to the exodus. But "as seeing the invisible" seems to point forward to the burning bush, and here as in S. Stephen's speech the spiritual education of Moses in the wilderness is the proper sequel to his secular education in Pharaoh's court, and the preparation for his redemptive work. The author deliberately corrects the letter of Ex. ii. 14 by the deeper truth of Moses' real courage, which he gathers from the whole context.

28. *sprinkling*] Cf. ix. 21 f., though the Greek is not quite the same as either of the words used there. The corresponding verb is frequent in the ritual chapters of the Pentateuch for the dashing of the sacrificial blood against the altar, &c.

29. *the Red sea*] So LXX for Hebrew "sea of reeds." *assaying to do*] The idiomatic phrase in the Greek means generally "have experience of." That would give a grim sense here: see paraphrase. The phrase is repeated in v. 36 below, "had trial of," and perhaps it explains the rather pointless "they were tempted" or "tried" in v. 37: that superfluous word was originally written in the margin to indicate the meaning of the somewhat rare idiom.

32—38. FAITH: FROM THE JUDGES TO THE MACCABEES.

And what more am I to say? For time shall fail me if I tell the tale of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, of David too and Samuel and the prophets:—who by faith overcame kingdoms, wrought righteousness, won promises, stopped lions' mouths, quenched fire's power, escaped the sword's edge, were made powerful when they were weak, and strong in war; they turned back armies of invaders; women received their dead by resurrection; others were broken on the wheel, having refused the deliverance that was offered them so that they might attain the better resurrection; others again had bitter experience of mockings and scourgings, of bonds too and of prison; they were stoned, tortured, sawn asunder, died the death of the sword, went about in sheepskins, in goat-

Jericho fell down, after they had been compassed about
 31 for seven days. By faith Rahab the harlot perished not
 with them that were disobedient, having received the
 32 spies with peace. And what shall I more say? for the time
 will fail me if I tell of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah;
 33 of David and Samuel and the prophets: who through faith
 subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained
 34 promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the
 power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, from weak-
 ness were made strong, waxed mighty in war, turned to
 35 flight armies of aliens. Women received their dead by a
 resurrection: and others were ¹tortured, not accepting

¹ Or, *beaten to death*

skins; need, affliction, evil estate were theirs continually; men of whom the whole world was unworthy wandered about deserts, were fugitives in mountains and caves and holes in the ground.

32. *Samuel and the prophets*] Samuel, whose "ear the LORD uncovered" (1 Sam. ix. 15), inaugurated or restored the line of "inspired" prophets; cf. 1 Sam. iii. 20 f.; Amos iii. 7; Deut. xxxiv. 10, and contrast 1 Sam. x. 10—13, xix. 23 f.; 1 Kings xxii. 6 ff.

34. *from weakness were made strong*] Rendel Harris¹ sees a reference to Judith in this verse. Cf. Clem. lv. with Lightfoot's note.

armies] In the quotation, xiii. 11, this word has the meaning "camp," frequent in late Greek. Here it means "army in line of battle," as often in Polybius and LXX. This is however especially frequent in 1 Macc. And at this point the author seems to turn his mind almost entirely to the Maccabean heroisms, especially to the famous narrative of the Maccabean martyrs in 2 Macc. vi. and vii. —"before the martyrs greatest martyrs," as the Prayer-Book of the Greek Church styles them. Thus "stopped the mouths of the lions" looks like a verbal reminiscence of Dan. vi. 22. But that particular Greek phrase is not in LXX of Daniel, we only know it from Theodotion's version, and the general reference might be to 1 Macc. ii. 60. The women who received their dead may be those mentioned in 1 Kings xvii. 17 ff.; 2 Kings iv. 17 ff. But the thought of "resurrection" is greatly deepened if the mother of the seven martyrs is particularly included. See her noble words in 2 Macc. vii. 29. The "better resurrection" will then be a climax not a contrast, and the reality of her receiving will be like the saving of our Lord "out of death" in v. 7 f.

35. *tortured*] *distenti sunt* vg., "beaten to death" margin: a late word for a late form of torture, which however can too well be

¹ *Side lights on N.T. research*, pp. 170 f.

¹their deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection: and others had trial of mockings and ³⁶ scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were ³⁷ tempted, they were slain with the sword: they went about in sheepskins, in goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, evil entreated (of whom the world was not worthy), wandering ³⁸ in deserts and mountains and caves, and the holes of the earth. And these all, having had witness borne to them ³⁹ through their faith, received not the promise, God having ⁴⁰ ²provided some better thing concerning us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect.

¹ Gr. *the redemption*.

² Or, *foreseen*

translated into English "broken upon the wheel." Cf. 2 Macc. vi. 28 ff.

37. *sawn asunder*] Isaiah is said in an apocryphal book to have been sawn asunder, but it would be strange to hark back here to an early prophet. Yet see Clem. xvii., who says that by those who went about "in goatskins and sheepskins preaching the advent of Christ," he understands Elijah, Elisha and Ezekiel. Intr. ii. 4.

were tempted] See note on v. 29 *supra*.

38. The punctuation of W.H. gives better rythm and more vigorous sense than is got by the parenthesis of R.V.: see paraphrase.

39—40. DEFERRED FRUITION.

And yet all these, though canonised through faith in the witness of Scripture, lacked fruition of the promise; inasmuch as God, with us to-day in view, had provided a better fulfilment than they could conceive, that the completion of their blessedness might not be achieved without our co-operation.

39. *having had witness borne to them*] This passage takes up the "witness borne" of v. 2. In xii. 1 "being witnessed to" passes into "witnessing": at each stage in the salutary sufferings of the Christ the partakers of those sufferings become in their turn witnesses, and the earthly scene is filled with invisible as well as visible spectators. Indeed in xii. 1 we are not far from the idea of "martyrdom," cf. note on xi. 2 *supra*, also cf. 1 Cor. iv. 9; 1 Pet. i. 11 f. (where notice the affinity with our author's doctrine of angels), v. 1, 9; 1 Tim. vi. 12 f., and the testimony of the nations in Is. lii. 13—liii.

40. *apart from us*] In spite of xii. 23, it seems as though the author presses this argument here upon the little group of friends whom he is urging to their imminent duty—the perfect satisfaction of these O.T. saints waits for their hastening or hindering it. Intr. iii. 23.

12 Therefore let us also, seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, lay aside ¹every weight, and the sin which ²doth so easily beset us, and let us

¹ Or, *all cumbrance*

² Or, *doth closely cling to us* Or, *is admired of many*

CH. XII. 1—3. THE MARTYRS' TRIAL.

Now we in our turn are on trial. Those whose faithfulness was attested in the past are now to attest ours. They are spread round us like a cloud of spiritual spectators as we stand in the arena. Therefore, though hesitation to do our appointed duty clings to us like the wrap which the anxious athlete shrinks from casting off, let not hesitation become the sin of refusal. Let us cast it off and run with steady resolution the race that stretches before us, looking past the fears of sense to Him who leads us into the mysteries of faith and will lead us to their consummation; even Jesus, who in the trial set before His manhood balanced pain with heroic joy, and with a noble scorn of shame resolutely faced the cross. So hath He been enthroned on God's right hand. Mark Him well, for our contest is all one with His; what Korah-like gainsaying hath He so resolutely endured from men who sinned against themselves in opposing Him. Still men gainsay, and still His firmness gives us power, so that your faint-heartedness need not end in failure.

1. *cloud*] A common metaphor; here particularly appropriate to the gathering of "spirits," xii. 23.

which doth so easily beset us] Not elsewhere except in passages dependent on this. It is one doubly compounded word which should mean "standing well round" or "stood well around." The active sense is taken by the vg. *circumstans* and the first rendering in R.V. marg. "doth closely cling to us." The passive is suggested by Isocrates' use of almost the same word, of one who is surrounded by admirers: so the second marginal rendering "is admired of many." That would well describe the "specious" sin (cf. iii. 13) in which, if they yield, the readers' honour will stand rooted in dishonour. No vague besetting sin is meant, but failure in the particular duty which the ep. is written to urge. The picture here presented (cf. vi. 19 f.) is of a race-course; the O.T. heroes are watching to bear witness how the readers of the ep. will acquit themselves: they, having Jesus now in sight, who has run the same course and now sits visible on His throne at the goal—note perf. "hath sat down," which at last marks a new stage in the argument of the ep.—they are preparing to run the race. This picture suggests an active sense for the adjective. The sin which presses on all sides upon the readers is like the wrap which the athlete, in the anxious moments before the start, shrinks from laying aside—

run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto ² Jesus the ¹author and perfecter of *our* faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God. For consider him that hath endured such gain- ³ saying of sinners against ²themselves, that ye wax not

¹ Or, *captain*

² Many authorities, some ancient, read *himself*.

"we must strip off those many tunics of ours," Porphyry, *de abstinentia*. Cf. Clem. vii. "for we are in the same lists, and the same contest is before us. Wherefore let us away with our vain and empty fancies...let us look steadfastly to the blood of the Christ." *run*] might be used figuratively of any contest, but the foot-race makes the best picture here.

the race that is set before us] The Sixtine and Clementine vg. have *ad propositum certamen*. Hence A.V. in its original text "unto the race." Notice in the Prayer-Book how this passage helped Cosin to bring the 1549 version of the collect for IV Advent into its fine present form.

2. *author and perfecter*] Cf. ii. 10. This has been well rendered, "He who trod the path before us and trod it perfectly to the end¹." Yet the idea of a captain in arms is included. In "perfecter" the author, who never labours his imagery, is passing from the romantic picture to the realism of *vv.* 3 f.

for the joy that was set before him] This corresponds to "set before us" in last verse. Not the future reward but the immediate "joy of battle" is meant. Cf. Father R. M. Benson, *Letters*, p. 201, "The joy which comes after peace is a spurious joy, an earthly one, if it is a joy because there is peace in our days."

endured] takes up "patience," which is the cognate noun ("endurance") in Greek, from preceding verse (cf. x. 32, 36), and is echoed in *vv.* 3 and 7. The thought is characteristic of this ep. of the divine manhood. "The message of the cross to sufferers is this, that the highest and greatest victory that has ever been won in human nature was won by the perseverance of faith, hope and charity—in a word, by patience,—under the pressure of sufferings that were neither removed nor mitigated, but endured; and that, provided we can, by the grace of God, meet trouble in a spirit which is essentially the same, however much weaker in degree, we may win the same kind of victory in our measure²." Cf. note on iv. 15, and Intr. II. 15, III. 15.

3. *sinners against themselves*] This, certainly the true reading, is a reminiscence of Num. xvi. 37 (xvii. 2). Its bitterness is turned

¹ *Foundations*, p. 192.

² F. M. Downton, in *The Cowley Evangelist*, June, 1914.

- 4 weary, fainting in your souls. Ye have not yet resisted
 5 unto blood, striving against sin: and ye have forgotten
 the exhortation, which reasoneth with you as with sons,
 My son, regard not lightly the chastening of the Lord,
 Nor faint when thou art reprov'd of him;
 6 For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth,
 And scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.

by the complementary utterance of our Lord, Luke xxiii. 34. R.V. marg. and A.V. shew again how later readers were offended by the vigorous apostolic intellect.

4—13. CHASTISEMENT THE REVELATION OF THE FATHER'S LOVE.

In your wrestle with the threatening sin of these critical days you have not yet had to face death, and you have forgotten the consolation which comes to you like a father's voice pleading with his sons: "My son, despise not the chastening of the LORD, nor yet faint when thou art reprov'd by him; for whom the LORD loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." Wait manfully for His chastisement. As with sons He dealeth with you, He who is God. For is there ever a son whom a true father does not chasten? If you stay outside the discipline of the divine family into which the whole suffering world of men have been initiated, you must be bastards and not sons. And further: if we accepted the fathers who begat us as disciplinarians and so learned to respect them, shall we not much more readily submit to "the Father of spirits" and so rise to life? To the life, I mean, which is life indeed; for if they, according to their poor judgement which looked forward but for a few days, used to exercise discipline, He knows what is really for His children's good and means them to share the holiness of His own life. All chastening indeed seems at the moment to be a matter of pain, not of joy: yet afterwards it yields fruit of peace to those who have been trained thereby—the peace of righteousness. Wherefore "the slackened hands and the palsied knees do ye set firm and straight," and "straight paths be ye making for your feet," that the lame folk be not led astray but rather be healed.

4. *sin*] "The sin" in Greek, significantly: cf. note on iii. 13 and Intr. IV. 1. The sin of failing in the one hard duty set before the readers of the ep. at that very time is meant.

5. *which reasoneth with you*] As though discipline were a person, cf. xi. 9, xii. 24; Intr. IV. 1. The quotation is from Prov. xi. 3 f. To our author the discipline of love raises natural relationship into spiritual. Cf. Leonian Sacramentary: "God who by loving dost chasten, and by chastening dost cherish."

The quotation is from Prov. iii. 11 f. Philo also cites the verse.

¹ It is for chastening that ye endure; God dealeth with you 7 as with sons; for what son is there whom *his* father chasteneth not? But if ye are without chastening, 8 whereof all have been made partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons. Furthermore, we had the fathers 9 of our flesh to chasten us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of ²spirits, and live? For they verily for a few 10 days chastened *us* as seemed good to them; but he for *our* profit, that *we* may be partakers of his holiness. All 11 chastening seemeth for the present to be not joyous, but grievous: yet afterward it yieldeth peaceable fruit unto them that have been exercised thereby, *even the fruit* of righteousness. Wherefore ³lift up the hands that hang 12 down, and the palsied knees; and make straight paths for 13 your feet, that that which is lame be not ⁴turned out of the way, but rather be healed.

¹ Or, *Endure unto chastening*

² Or, *our spirits*

³ Gr. *make straight*.

⁴ Or, *put out of joint*

7. *for chastening*] As often in the ep. some trial seems indicated which is nigh but not yet come, cf. 1 Pet. iv. 12. But in the "received text" and A.V. the characteristic prep. has been turned into "if" by the striking off of its last letter, the foreboding is dulled, and the cheerful faith in God's fatherhood is made dependent on His creatures' resignation.

9. *Father of spirits*] Cf. Num. xvi. 22; Apoc. xxii. 6, and v. 23 *infra*. Some printed edd. of the Syriac Bible give "fathers of spirits" (i.e. "spiritual fathers"?) here. That is a misprint or misreading of the mss. But the Armenian translation of Ephraem's commentaries seems to shew that he actually had this reading in the older version which he knew.

12. *lift up, &c.*] From Is. xxxv. 3; a close rendering of Heb.; yet there seems to be a reminiscence of LXX also.

13. *that which is lame*] Prob. concrete, "lame persons," cf. "the many," v. 15; Intr. iv. 1. But, giving a later sense to the verb, we might translate, "that your lameness grow not worse"; see margin.

An adaptation of Prov. iv. 26, LXX. The adaptation is, according to most mss., in metre of so marked a kind as to be a real blot upon the author's rythmical taste: see Intr. iv. 3. Happily the best mss. give one word in a slightly different form and save him from this imputation.

14 Follow after peace with all men, and the sanctification
 15 without which no man shall see the Lord: looking carefully ¹lest *there be* any man that ²falleth short of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble
 16 *you*, and thereby the many be defiled; ¹lest *there be* any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one mess of
 17 meat sold his own birthright. For ye know that even when he afterward desired to inherit the blessing, he was

¹ Or, *whether*

² Or, *falleth back from*

14—17. CHARITY WITH LOYALTY.

Peace: Yes, "pursue peace" with all men. But do not, for the dream of peace, desert the consecrated fellowship outside of which no one shall see the Lord at His coming. Keep that unviolated, continually interesting yourselves in the brethren lest there should be any one in lack of the common treasure of God's grace; lest any root of bitterness spring up into a noxious plant, and thereby the simple multitude be defiled; lest any one be corrupted with lewd heresy or worldly ambition, as Esau was, who for one dish of food sold his proper birthright. For you know that when he did afterwards wish to claim his inherited blessing he lost his plea—no "place for afterthought" was allowed in that court—though with tears he had sought diligently to recover it.

14. *Follow after peace*] Cf. Ps. xxxiv. (xxxiii.) 14; Rom. xii. 18. *the sanctification*] A Pauline word, but here used in the more special sense of LXX, the consecration which marks the people of God. So 2 Macc. ii. 17: "Now God, who saved all his people, and restored the heritage to all, and the kingdom, and the priesthood, and the consecration." It introduces a warning like those in vi. 4 ff., x. 26 f.; such a warning as was hardened later into *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. This warning is in iambic metre and has almost a proverbial ring; but it is followed by a second iambic line which is too plainly due to the author's carelessness.

15 f. *lest any root of bitterness, &c.*] From Deut. xxix. 18 with certain variations which are probably due to our author's adapting memory. For the sequence of thought cf. this coincidence or reminiscence in Leighton quoted by Coleridge¹: "The boasted peaceableness about questions of faith too often proceeds from a superficial temper, and not seldom from a supercilious disdain of whatever has no marketable use or value, and from indifference to religion itself. Toleration is a herb of spontaneous growth in the soil of indifference; but the weed has none of the virtues of the medicinal plant, reared by humility in the garden of zeal."

¹ *Aids, Moral and Rel. Aph. xxvi.*

rejected (for he found no place of repentance), though he sought it diligently with tears.

17 *though he sought it diligently*] For Esau's profaneness and tears see Gen. xxv. 33 f., xxvii. 30—40. "It" might refer to "the blessing," and Gen. xxvii. 34 supports that explanation, which is adopted by W.H. in their punctuation. The sense is much the same, whether "blessing" or "repentance" be referred to. Esau's hopeless loss (which however is not represented in Gen. as eternal rejection from God) is a warning to the readers of the ep. whose hesitation involves a fearful risk of ruin. We find the phrase "place of repentance" in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch lxxxv., and the Latin 2 Esdr. ix. 12. In these books, which were consolations to the Jews after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, the doctrine is that in the day of judgement repentance will be no longer possible. In Wisd. xii. 10, 20, the same phrase occurs in praise of "the God of the fathers and Lord of his own mercy" who gives so many opportunities of repentance. Westcott quotes from Pliny's letter (x. 97) to Trajan on the Christians: "whence it is easy to infer what a multitude of men might be recovered from error if there were a place of repentance"; and from Ulpian, as though it were a term of Roman law, in the third century at least. The phrase had wide applications and need not have conveyed to the first readers the theological hopelessness it suggests here to us; Intr. III. 20.

18—27. THE TREMENDOUS HAZARD IN ETERNAL THINGS.

This is a stern warning, for in eternal things the issue of our choice is tremendous. In this crisis you have come near to no material fire of kindled stuff, to darkness and gloom and storm and trumpet-clang and sound of words, of the which sound those who heard it begged that they might have no further explanation. For they had been moved beyond endurance by that awfully distinct command, "If so much as a beast touch the mountain it shall be stoned." And so fearful was the apparition, Moses said, "I am beside myself with fear and all a-tremble." No, you stand on the frontier of eternity, near to Sion the mount and city of the living God, Jerusalem in heaven above; and myriads of angels in festal assembly; and to the church of the firstborn, the patriarchal saints whose names are enrolled in heaven; and to God the judge of all; and to the spirits of those later saints whose righteousness has been divinely perfected; and to the mediator of the covenant which now renews its youth, even to Jesus; and to the Blood of that un-earthly ritual, tragic, personal, brotherly, which speaks, as Abel speaks, unceasingly but with a meaning all divine.

See that you refuse Him not who is thus speaking. For if the Israelites escaped not from God's purpose when in the limited and earthly revelation at Sinai they had refused their human

18 For ye are not come unto ¹*a mount* that might be
 touched, and that burned with fire, and unto blackness,
 19 and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet,
 and the voice of words; which *voice* they that heard
 intreated that no word more should be spoken unto them:
 20 for they could not endure that which was enjoined, If even
 21 a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned; and so
 fearful was the appearance, *that* Moses said, I exceedingly
 22 fear and quake: but ye are come unto mount Zion, and

¹ Or, *a palpable and kindled fire*

interpreter, how much less we who are all but turning our back on our Lord who speaks from heaven. That other voice at Sinai, the voice which shook the earth, was His. And now too it is He whom we hear proclaiming in the words of the ancient prophecy, "Yet once more will I myself shake" not only "earth" but also "heaven." That "once more" signifies the removal of the things that are shaken, I mean the whole fabric of institutions human and divine, in order that the realities which are never shaken may come and abide.

18—21. These verses are full of reminiscences of Ex. xix. 11—13; Deut. iv. 11 f., cf. also Deut. v. 22, ix. 19. But "that might be touched" is the author's own. Some mss. add "mount," but the authority for omission is decisive. To "understand" it from v. 22, as in R.V., seems weak. It is possible to take the partt. as neuters, expressing vague horror: "Something tangible and seared with fire." But vg. has *ad tractabilem et accensibilem ignem* = "a palpable and kindled fire" (margin). Dr E. C. Selwyn¹ emends conjecturally and so gets "a mount all burnt into volcanic craters." He says that the text could only mean "a fire burnt out." If so, "a tangible fire and presently burnt out" would stand in good antithesis with "our God is a consuming fire" at the conclusion of this passage. But it is easier to explain the perfect from the primary meaning of the second verb as "having been kindled." The author's addition "palpable" governs the clause. Exodus and Deuteronomy express the terribleness of Sinai; he thinks of the material quality of its terror in contrast with the invisible, personal, spiritual richness of the mount and city of the living God, vv. 22 ff. It is that inherent quality which he tries to suggest by this perf. part.

21. *the appearance*] A participle resembling our "phantom." It is a nicely selected word; it gives to the whole description what Victor Hugo in his funeral oration on Balzac expressed as "*je ne sais quoi d'effaré et de terrible mêlé au réel.*"

¹ JTS, Oct. 1910.

unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,
¹and to ²innumerable hosts of angels, to the general ²³
assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in
heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of
just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of a ²⁴
new ³covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that

¹ Or, *and to innumerable hosts, the general assembly of angels, and the church &c.*

² Gr. *myriads of angels.*

³ Or, *testament*

22 f. For the heavenly Jerusalem cf. Apoc. iii. 12, xxi. 2; Gal. iv. 26 f. with Lightfoot's note on S. Paul's use of "an expression familiar to rabbinical teachers." In O.T. too Sion and Jerusalem have sacramental significance, see esp. Ps. lxxxvii. Whether "the heavenly Jerusalem" be joined with "the city" only or taken in apposition to the whole preceding clause, may be left to the reader's taste. Whether "general assembly" should go with angels is a more interesting question. Tradition, including versions and punctuated mss., is on the whole for taking these words together; so vg. *multorum milium angelorum frequentiae*. The author's penchant for iambic cadences makes for this. Perhaps "myriads of angels in festal array" would be a better translation of the words thus arranged than that given in the margin. The Preface of the Latin Mass has been modelled on this passage: the Latin form is nearer to it than our "Angels and archangels and all the company of heaven."

23. *church*] In the first division of Acts which tells of the apostolic community in Jerusalem, this title is reserved, in technical sense—v. 11 is different—for the ancient Jewish Church. So probably in this ep. Hence the "firstborn" are O.T. saints, who are enrolled in heaven, even though xi. 40 should imply that the realisation of their birthright is delayed. The daughter Church, the disciples of Jesus, will then follow with "and to the spirits." The universal "God, the judge of all"—looking back as judge and forward to His "all in all" (1 Cor. xv. 28)—connects the two

the firstborn who are enrolled] Cf. Ex. xxxii. 32; Ps. lxxxvii. 6; Is. iv. 3; Dan. vii. 10, xii. 1; R. M. Benson, *Letters*, p. 220, "As the circle of affectionate memories becomes enlarged in the heavenly record, we learn increasingly the blessedness of the eternal bond which unites us in the company of all saints."

spirits of just men made perfect] See Intr. III. 23, 24, 25.

24. *mediator*] Here with imaginative propriety; the mediator is not merely the *intermundius* of God and man, He links the ancient church with the new heirs.

a new covenant] A different adjective from that in ix. 15. That did mean simply "new," this is rather "young." Since it can

25 speaketh better ¹ than *that* of Abel. See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not, when they refused him that warned *them* on earth, much more *shall not we escape*, who turn away from him ² that *warneth* from
 26 heaven: whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more will I make to
 27 tremble not the earth only, but also the heaven. And this *word*, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that have been made, that those things which are not shaken may remain.
 28 Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken,

¹ Or, *than Abel*

² Or, *that is from heaven*

of course be used more generally, the quasi-personification (cf. xii. 5) is not bizarre; indeed it seems natural in this picture of exultant life. In Gilbert's reredos at S. Alban's Abbey the crown of thorns on the head of the Lord rising from the tomb is just breaking into leaf. When the High Priest entered the true sanctuary there was a renascence of the world. So in 1 Pet. i. 3, "Who according to his great mercy begat us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." Cf. Philo, *sacr. Abel et Cain*, p. 178, "While they receive with all-abundant liberality good things young and new from God who grows not old but is ever young, let them learn to hold as truth that with him nothing is old or lost in the abyss of time, but every thing becomes timelessly and stands in being."

26. The shaking of heaven and earth is quoted with added emphasis from Haggai (ii. 6), who prophesied when an older ritual had passed away and a new worship was beginning with little outward promise.

28—29. THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

Those realities are what our fathers called The Kingdom of God; and that kingdom which shall not pass away we are receiving in this final issue of the ages. Wherefore let us shew gratitude, and in the kingdom do loyal service well pleasing to God with reverence and awe, for our God is, as He was of old, "fire"—not material but "consuming."

28. *a kingdom*] The "kingdom" or "reign" of God was the symbol by which salvation was preached and wrought in the Galilean gospel. After the synoptists and Acts it falls into the background of N.T. till the Apocalypse. But the primitive language now and then reasserts itself as here: Intr. II. II, III. 32. For "that cannot be shaken" cf. Dan. vii. 14.

let us have ¹grace, whereby we may offer service well-pleasing to God with ²reverence and awe: for our God is a ²⁹ consuming fire.

Let love of the brethren continue. Forget not to shew ¹³ love unto strangers: for thereby some have entertained angels unawares. Remember them that are in bonds, as ³ bound with them; them that are evil entreated, as being yourselves also in the body. *Let* marriage *be* had in honour ⁴ among all, and *let* the bed *be* undefiled: for fornicators and adulterers God will judge. ³Be ye free from the love of ⁵

¹ Or, *thankfulness*

² Or, *godly fear*

³ Gr. *Let your turn of mind be free.*

have grace] This strangely literal translation seems to have come through the Vulgate. In classical Greek the phrase would naturally mean "shew gratitude." Such nice use of language is rare in the rest of N.T. but not in this epistle. R.V. margin is therefore to be preferred. Intr. iv. i.

^{29. consuming fire}] From Deut. iv. 24; cf. vv. 18 ff. *supr.*

CH. XIII. 1—6. PRECEPTS OF GOOD CHURCHMANSHIP.

Let brotherly love which has always bound together the family of Christ continue to do so. Love is also due to those without, do not forget it; for through that wider love some have entertained angels unawares. Be mindful of people in prison—in these perilous times you are as good as prisoners yourselves; and of those in misery or want—the weakness of our mortal nature is the blessed source of sympathy. Marriage? Everywhere honourable, and the marriage bed always pure. I speak not of fornicators and adulterers; God will judge them. A fine carelessness of money: everyone content with daily bread. For it is the very *Ipse dixit* of God: "Be sure I will not overlook thee; most certainly I will not forsake thee." So we Christians must be of good courage and repeat: "The LORD is my help, I will not fear. What shall man do to me?"

1. *love of the brethren*] Cf. the sketch of the churchman's temper in 1 Pet. iii. 8 f., and to measure the intensity of this apostolic love read through 1 John.

2. Cf. Rom. xii. 13; Gen. xviii. 3, xix. 2; "strangers" may mean others than journeying brethren, cf. 3 John 10; for the "strangeness" of Christians in pagan eyes 1 Pet. iv. 4.

3. *as...in the body*] Cf. 2 Cor. v. 6 rather than Rom. xii. 5: the Latin rightly paraphrases "sojourning in the body," and Virgil would have understood—*mentem mortalia tangunt*.

money; content with such things as ye have: for himself hath said, I will in no wise fail thee, neither will I in any
6 wise forsake thee. So that with good courage we say,

The Lord is my helper; I will not fear:

What shall man do unto me?

7 Remember them that had the rule over you, which spake unto you the word of God; and considering the
8 issue of their ¹life, imitate their faith. Jesus Christ *is* the

¹ Gr. *manner of life*.

5. *himself*] emphatic: cf. Clem. xvi. of "Christ Himself, in whose person the Psalmist is speaking."

I will in no wise, &c.] The quot. is adapted from Deut. xxxi. 6, 8; Jos. i. 5: that in the next verse is from Ps. cxviii. (cxvii.) 6.

6. *So that with good courage, &c.*] With this martyr-courage cf. the *amorem intellectualem Dei* of Plato: "Therefore if the truth of reality is always in our soul (as it is), the soul should be immortal; so that you ought with good courage to set about seeking and remembering what you do not happen to know now, that is what you do not remember now." *Meno* 86 B.

What shall man do unto me?] The interrogative might be used in Alexandrine and popular Greek as a relative: so A.V., cf. Mark xiv. 36. But, apart from the original context in LXX, the more spirited interrogative form which W.H. prefer is far more in keeping with the aphoristic style of this passage.

7. MEMORIAL OF DEPARTED LEADERS.

Cherish the memory of your leaders, men who spoke to you the word God gave them. And contemplating with ever fresh wonder the supreme event of their career, be imitators of their faith.

7. *them that had the rule*] Clement uses this word and also a compound form of it (I., xxi.) of the officers of the Church in a general sense: cf. Luke xxii. 26. But Clement also uses it of civil or military rulers (xxxvii.), and it is often applied to the leaders of the Jews in 1 and 2 Macc. This passage seems to imply teaching as a function of the leadership, and to hint at martyrdom—for it has a militant ring. But it is impossible to guess whether they were bishops, elders, presidents at the eucharistic service, or founders of the community to which the readers belonged.

manner of life (margin)] It is the Pauline noun "conversation"; the "going up and down the street" which almost supersedes for him, a townsman, the Galilean metaphor of the "way."

same yesterday and to-day, *yea* and ¹for ever. Be not ⁹carried away by divers and strange teachings: for it is

¹ Gr. *unto the ages*.

8—16. THE SACRAMENT OF CALVARY.

Jesus Christ, yesterday and to-day the same; *yea*, and while the *ages* run. Elaborate precepts are rife which are as novel to Judaism as to us. Do not swerve because of them from the onward course. For it is a noble thing to have the heart founded deeper and deeper by simple grace. But rules of food are mean—a trivial, disappointing round. We are beyond such cares; the ministers of the tabernacle partake of the sacrificial food; our altar is of a different order. Indeed it is in outward appearance more analogous to the place outside the camp where the refuse of the high priest's sacrifice was (as we read) burned. It was on Calvary, outside Jerusalem, that Jesus, in order to sanctify the people of God, suffered as a criminal. Therefore let us go forth to Him outside the camp, bearing the burden which associates us with His shame. With His shame; but also with the inward spiritual reality of His sacrifice, for the city which we must now leave was never our abiding home; but, beyond the shows of sense, we seek the city God has destined for us. By the priestly mediation of our Lord Jesus let us offer up a sacrifice which prophets and psalmists loved, a sacrifice of praise which ascends to God unhindered by all the changes and chances of ritual; I mean the "fruit of lips," the sweet mystery of language by which we interpret our heartfelt devotion to His essential perfection. And do not forget to be kind to one another and to share your earthly goods; for such acts are also sacrifices with which God is well pleased.

8. No verb is required. As in the original Hebrew of the *Shema'* (Deut. vi. 4) this is a battle cry rather than a creed. So *Maran atha* = "Lord come!" in 1 Cor. xvi. 22, cf. Apoc. xxii. 20 and *vv.* 4 f. above.

9. *carried away*] The "received text," followed by A.V., has perpetuated the "carried about" of a few ancient authorities; with that cf. Eph. iv. 14. But in this ep. the danger is not of vague misbelief but of taking the wrong turn at a particular choice; cf. ii. 1, xii. 13. This might seem to recommend the reading of most mss., "them that have been occupied" A.V. and so in fact R.V., i.e. "those who have taken to that walk," who have already made the wrong choice. But the consensus of primary authorities is almost decisive for the present participle, and such a rendering of the aorist would not really suit the ep., in which the trial is always envisaged as being imminent yet still future; cf. vi. 4—9, xii. 5—7.

grace] Cf. note on iv. 16. Here, as in ii. 9, the main idea seems to be of the absolute bounty of God which can neither be disputed

good that the heart be stablished by grace; not by meats, wherein they that¹ occupied themselves were not profited.
 10 We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which
 11 serve the tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the holy place² by the high priest as an offering for sin, are burned without the camp.
 12 Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people
 13 through his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us therefore go forth unto him without the camp, bearing his
 14 reproach. For we have not here an abiding city, but we
 15 seek after *the city* which is to come. Through him³ then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually,

¹ Gr. *walked*.

² Gr. *through*.

³ Some ancient authorities omit *then*.

nor measured. Yet something further makes itself felt. How far does this rich Greek word imply beauty of form or character in N.T.—“the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ”? There is certainly much feeling in N.T. for that kind of “grace”; our Lord and the ilies; S. Paul in Phil. iv. 8; the sense of “honour” in this epistle; the angels in festal array; the love of language, often so delicate in pathos; the *desiderium* for the golden splendour of the tabernacle, and (more exquisitely) for the tragic simplicity of “the days of His flesh.”

meats] Cf. Rom. xiv. ; 1 Tim. iv. 3; Col. ii. 21 ff. The reference is not to the rules of Leviticus, but to novel “unfitness and irrelevance of teaching...barren and mischievous trivialities usurping the office of religion¹.”

10 f. Another picture, completing vi. 19 f., xii. 1 f. Here Jesus, who in vi. is out of sight, in xii. in sight but distant, is to be joined (13). And this imminent reality compels the author to dissolve his picture almost while he draws it. The imagery is thoroughly sacramental. When the Lord died on the cross, that scene of “shame” (xii. 2), what could be seen was like the off-scouring of a sacrifice (11; cf. Lev. xvi. 27). But what really took place in the eternal sphere was the entrance of the divine High Priest with His own sacrificial Blood into the presence of the Father. And the sacrament is complete, for we, says the author, are to appropriate its efficacy by doing as He did in visible shame and spiritual glory (13 f.; cf. ii. 9, vi. 20, xii. 4, xiii. 7, 20). The imagery is borrowed from Levitical ritual, but no care is taken to make all the details correspond; that ritual is not obeyed as a type, it is merely suggestive. Intr. III. 5, 7.

¹ Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 134.

that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to his name. But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with 16 such sacrifices God is well pleased. Obey them that have 17 the rule over you, and submit to *them*: for they watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account; that they may do this with joy, and not with ¹grief: for this *were* unprofitable for you.

¹ Gr. *groaning*.

15. Cf. Ps. l. (xlix.) 14; Lev. vii. 12 (2); 2 Chr. xxix. 31; Is. lvii. 19 (Heb.); Hos. xiv. 2.

The "sacrifices" of these verses are not the same as that which informs the whole theology of the ep. Christ's one sacrifice could not be declined into the plural number. Here the idea is rather that even in the ritual of Christian worship there is a more than adequate substitute for the many sacrifices of Judaism. Nor was this doctrine altogether strange to Jews. Philo and other, especially Hellenistic, teachers had already recognised that it was enshrined in the Old Testament for the deepening of religion. Intr. II. 4, III. 13.

16. *to communicate*] This rendering, perhaps ambiguous to untrained ears, is part of our English heritage from the Vulgate. The word is a noun, the same that is used of the "fellowship of the Holy Ghost" and of the apostolic community in Jerusalem (Acts ii. 42). It means more than almsgiving. "All that believed ...had all things common" (Acts ii. 44, iv. 32) shews the word and the idea in their root form.

17. LOYALTY TO THOSE ON WHOM THE BURDENS OF RESPONSIBILITY LIE HEAVILY.

Be pliant to your leaders' advice and commands. They bear the weight of responsibility, and are watching through dark hours over you, the living souls entrusted to them; they know the account that must be rendered of such a charge. See to it that they may do their duty with happy cheer and no occasion for groaning—that would scarcely be to your profit.

17. *watch*] and that "sleeplessly." Can this be a reminiscence of the type of leadership, S. Paul? See 2 Cor. vi. 5, xi. 27. Or is it rather a grim touch of reality in this document of the warfare that occupied the corner of the apostolic Church to which this letter was written? There at any rate the command of the Lord was already approving itself as necessary; "to watch...watch therefore...lest he find you sleeping...what I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch." Mark xiii. 34 f.

18 Pray for us: for we are persuaded that we have a good
 19 conscience, desiring to live honestly in all things. And I
 exhort *you* the more exceedingly to do this, that I may be
 restored to you the sooner.

20 Now the God of peace, who brought again from the
 dead the great shepherd of the sheep ¹with the blood of

¹ Or, *by* Gr. *in*.

18—21. COMMUNION IN PRAYER.

Think of us in your prayers; for we would fain believe that our inmost mind is known to God, and we desire nothing else than to be true to His honour in all our dealings. And more than ever do I beseech you to do this, in order that I may be the sooner restored to you.

And may God who makes peace in troubled times, who brought up from the dead the Shepherd of the sheep in the Blood of the Eternal Covenant, that great shepherd of prophecy, the transmuter of the ancient symbol of Life through Death into reality by His obedience to God's will, even our Lord Jesus—may God confirm your shrinking resolution with all or any driving force of goodness for the doing of that duty which His will demands; while He continues to do with us (whose peace is already in His will) just that which is well-pleasing in His sight; may God do all this for you and us through Jesus, now exalted as Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever: Amen, even so may God's will be done.

18. *us*] The author says little about himself, and we cannot tell precisely what he means by this plural. In *v.* 21, as well as here, it implies community in conscience at least as much as in circumstances (cf. *iv.* 3). It might even be a modest way of saying "me"; notice the modesty of assertion in "I am persuaded" and contrast *Phil.* i. 25, "I am fully persuaded and know," with Lightfoot's note. It is perhaps worth remarking that a similar request for remembrance in prayer is introduced in *Eph.* vi. 18 f. by "watching" (cf. *v.* 17 *supra*).

20. This blessing sums up the doctrine and purpose of the epistle. It may be compared with the liturgical conclusion of Clement's epistle, but the form is different. Clement's prayer resembles the Greek liturgies; this is like a western collect, terse with close-knit movement, asking for a particular gift of grace: *Intr.* ii. 4 and 1 (analysis).

In *v.* 20 there is the solemn invocation: in *v.* 21 the main petition for the author's friends that they may be enabled to do their particular pressing duty ("to do" is aor. inf. = "to do at once"), continued into the secondary petition for the author, and perhaps his fellow prisoners or fellow sojourners, that God's will may still be theirs. And all ends with the mediation of Jesus

the eternal covenant, *even* our Lord Jesus, make you ²¹ perfect in every good ¹ thing to do his will, working in ² us that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom *be* the glory ³ for ever and ever. Amen.

¹ Many ancient authorities read *work*.

² Many ancient authorities read *you*. ³ Gr. *unto the ages of the ages*

Christ, and a doxology which in the context seems to be addressed to Him in glory.

The passage from "our Lord Jesus" who did His duty in the days of His flesh, to "Jesus Christ" who has thus been perfected in His glorious office, is parallel to the passage from the author's petition for his friends to his petition for himself—their will is not yet lost and found in God's will, his own is. "Through Jesus Christ" is more than "through Him I offer prayer." It corresponds to the faith of the whole ep., that loyalty to Jesus the Lord is possible through His assumption of manhood into God.

But all this antithesis and particularity is lost in the later text which gives "in every good work" for "in every good," and repeats "you" instead of contrasting "you" and "us." Another addition which did not get into the received text is "Christ" after the first "Jesus"—so quoted in Lancelot Andrewes' *Preces Privatae*. All these are modifications which (like "hath visited" for "shall visit" in Luke i. 78) fitted the special prayer of the author to the general conditions of church worship. So perhaps "Amen" at the end of the epistle which R.V. keeps against the best group of documents. Intr. iv. 3, 4.

For the prophetic phraseology of v. 20 see Is. lxiii. 11; Zech. ix. 11; Is. lv. 3; Ez. xxxvii. 26.

"Amen" is explained by 2 Cor. i. 20; Apoc. xxii. 20.

"In every good" might be illustrated from the "in every way, whether in pretence or in truth" of Phil. i. 18, or at any rate from 1 Cor. ix. 22, "I am become all things to all men, that I may by all means save some." If "the living principle, the law within" them be not clear enough, then let any good motive be supplied that may drive them to the venture.

22—25. FINAL WORDS.

And, brothers, if this be too stern a treatise of exhortation, bear with it. I exhort you now in quite another tone. For here you see I am sending you also a real letter.

You know—or let me tell you, that our brother Timothy is at liberty. Accompanied by him, if he comes here reasonably soon, I will see you.

Greeting to all your leaders and to all the members of our holy Church. The brothers of Italy send greeting to you.

And now, in the words of one we all know and shall ever love, "Grace be with you all."

- 22 But I exhort you, brethren, bear with the word of exhortation: for I have written unto you in few words.
- 23 Know ye that our brother Timothy hath been set at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you.
- 24 Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints. They of Italy salute you.
- 25 Grace be with you all. Amen.

22. *the word of exhortation*] Cf. vii. 28. The "exhortation" of the author has been long and sometimes stern. Like S. Paul at the end of Galatians, he "softens the severity" by "brothers." He adds a further courtesy; there is an "also" in the Greek which might be merely general emphasis, but might imply a letter as well as an exhortation; these last paragraphs are indeed the kindly conclusion of a "letter" which had in its earlier pages grown into a treatise: so apparently A.V. Nor would the gentle play upon the two meanings of this verb and noun "exhort"... "consolation" be scorned. According to this interpretation "I have written" is epistolary aorist and means "I write" or "have just written."

We do not know where Timothy, or where the author was. In the next verse the Greek phrase "they from Italy" is a little more likely to mean, "Your friends in Italy send you greetings from thence" than "Your Italian friends send you greetings thither," because the former is idiomatic Greek in which this writer would take pleasure. But either rendering is perfectly justifiable. For the rest, the impression left on unsophisticated minds by the whole conclusion, with its reminiscences of Pauline phrases, and this mention of one Pauline name, might be that a glimpse is given of a little company of apostolic churchmen to whom S. Paul was a loved master, lately removed by death. The writer has been near the apostle in his peril, and is hastening to share a new peril which now threatens his friends.

INDEX

- Aaron, xiv, xlvii, lxv, lxviii, lxxiii, 23, 37, 50 f., 63 f.
 Abbott, 25 f.
 Abelard, xxxvi, 32
 Abraham, lxviii, 22, 25, 45 f., 49, 59, 87, 90
 Adam, J., 20
 Advent, lxxxvi f., xcv, xcvi, 9, 17, 45, 65, 72, 80, 84
 Aeschylus, lxxi, 79
 Africa, xix, xxiv, xxxi
 S. Alban's Abbey, 103
 Alexandria, xix ff., xxiii f., civ, cviii
 Alexandrine philosophy and scholarship, xxiii, xxx, xxxvii f., l, lv, lxiv, lxvii, civ, cx ff., cxv, 39, 50, 86 f.
 Alford, xxxii
 S. Ambrose, xxxii
 Amos, 2, 29
 Analogy, lvii, 34, 73 f., 76
 Andrewes, Lancelot, xxxv, III
 Anencletus or Cletus, xxv
 Angels, xii, lx, 7 ff., 17, 63, 103
 Antioch, xxxviii
 Apocalypse, xxiv, lv, lx, lxxxvi, lxxxviii, xcvi ff., cxvi, 10, 79
 Apocalyptic Christianity, xli f., liii
 Apollos, xxxix, xlii
 Apostle, xx, xxxii, 24
Apostles, The Teaching of, 80
 Approach to God, lvi, lxviii, lxxiv, lxxvii ff., 34 f., 65, 77
 Aquila, 62
 Aquinas, xxxv, 46
 Arianism, lx
 Aristion or Ariston, xxxix, 15
 Aristotle, 19
 Article, cvi, cxix, 3, 15, 98
 Articles of religion, lxix
 Ascension, xlii, xlv ff., lviii, lxi, cii f., 34
 S. Athanasius, xxiii
 Atonement, lvi, lxix ff., xci f.; day of, lxi, 48, 72 f., 108
 S. Augustine, xxxii f., xxxv, lxxxiv
 Baptism, lxii, lxxxviii, 42 f., 79, 82
 Barnabas (epistle), xxii, xxiv f., xxxi, xxxix, 63, 69, 92
 Baruch, apocalypse, 101
 Baur, xliii
 Bengel, 79
 Benson, R. M., xlvii, xcix, 97, 103
 Bethune-Baker, xxxviii
 Bigg, cix f.
 Blass, 86
 Bleek, xxxii
 Blood, xi, xxvi, xxxvii, xlvi, xlix, lxii, lxx ff., lxxx, 21, 61, 65, 70, 79
 Bousset, xliv, 14
 Box, 2 f., 22, 42, 71 f.
 Bréhier, cviii
 Brooke, xcv
 Bruce, xlviii
 Burkitt, xli
 Burnet, cxi, 47
 Caesarea, xxii
 Caird, cviii, cxv
 Calvin, xxxv, xxxvii
 Cambridge platonists, 36, 38
 Camerarius, 92
 Canterbury, archbishop of, lxxxix f.
 Captain, lxxxvi, xcvi, cxi, 48, 97
 Catholicity, xli ff.
Character, 4

- Charles, 52
 Cheyne, 9, 54, 75
 Chiasmus, 79
 Christ, xlii, xviii, li f., lv; in O.T., xi, xviii, li, lvii, lxvi, lxxxiv f., cv, 7 f., 20, 25, 37, 92 f.; inclusive, lxiii, lxxxiv f., 28, 73; prophet, priest and king, xxxvi, lvii; the eternal Son, xi f., xviii, lvii, lxiii, i ff.
 S. Chrysostom, xxxviii, 85
 Church, apostolic, xliii f., lii, 43, 103, 109; Jewish, li, lxxxi, lxxxiv, civ, cxiii, 8, 40 ff., 103
Church Quarterly Review, xcix
 Cicero, cxiv, 4
 City of God, xix, 87, 101
 Cleansing, lxix ff., lxxviii, 70, 79
 Clement of Alexandria, xx, cxxiv; of Rome, xxi, xxv ff., xxxiv, xxxix, 74, 82, 106, 110
 Codex **N**, cxxiii, 10; B, cxxiii, 10, 67; D, xxxi, cxxiii; Armachanus, 13, 79
 Coleridge, 5, 47, 85, 100
 Collects, 72, 97, 110
 Communion of saints, ciii f.
 Conscience, 67, 78
 Consecration, lxxxiii f., xcvi, 75 f., 91, 100
 Corinth, xxv ff.
 Cosin, 97
Cosmos, lxxxiii
 Covenant, xv, lxxix ff., 51, 53, 55 ff., 65, 68 f.
Cowley Evangelist, xcvi, xcix, 35, 97
 Creed, lxiii
Crisis, c, 72
 Crucifixion, xlii, lviii, lxi, 43 f., 71, 107 f.
 S. Cyprian, xxxi
 Cyril of Jerusalem, xxxv
 Daniel, xli, lxxxv, ci, 17, 71, 94
 Dante, xxxiii, lxxxiv
 Davidson, A. B., xlvii f., 6
 Day of the Lord, xvi, xlii, lxxxvi f., ci, 80, 100
 Death, xi, xlix, lii, lxxii ff., lxxxviii, xci f., xcvi, xcix, 100 ff.
 Deuteronomy, liii, 9, 15 f., 60, 75, 81, 100, 105 ff.
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 41
 Domitian, xxv
 Downton, 35, 97
 Drummond, cviii
 DuBose, xlii, xlvi, lxxv, lxxvii f., 35
 Ecclesiastes, 47
 Edwards, G. M., 47
eikon, 4, 73
 Enoch, xli, 87 f.
 Enthronement, 18, 96
 Ephraem Syrus, 99
 Epictetus, 86
 Erasmus, xxxiv, xxxvii, cxxii, 4
 Esau, xvii, 100 f.
 Estius, xxxiii f.
 Eternity, lxxviii f., xc, c, cvi, 39, 49, 66 f.
 Eucharist, xxvii, lxii, xcii, 79, 106
 Euripides, 44
 Euthalius, xxiv, cxxiv
 Evolution, lxvi, 6
 Ewing, lxxiv
 Ezekiel, lxix f., lxxxviii, 2, 17, 29, 95, 111
 Ezra, apocalypse, 21 f., 71 f., 101
 Faith, xvi, cxii ff., cxviii, 27, 77, 79, 82, 85 ff.
 Farrar, xlv
 Fathers, xxxv, xlix, lxxxviii, cxxiv
 Field, F., xc v f.
 Flesh, ci f., 21, 111; days of, lviii f., lxiv, cii, 38; way of, xii, xvi, cii, cxii, 77 f.
 Florus, liii
 Forerunner, x, 46
 Forgiveness, xv, lxix, lxxviii, lxxx, 76, 80 f.

- Gaius, xxix
 Gardner, 17
 Gaul, xxii
 Gethsemane, 38
 Glory in humiliation, xi, xlviii, lviii ff., 15, 18 f.
 Gobar, xxix
 Goodness, 66
 Gospel, lviii, 29, 59; synoptic, xxv, xxvii, xli, xlv, lix, cii, cxv f., 21, 38; fourth, xxvii, xlv, lxiv f., cxvi, 26
 Grace, 15, 19, 81, 107 f.
 Graeco-Roman, xliii f., 14
 Greek, of N.T., cxv f., 23, 43, 46; classical, cxvii, 18 f., 43, 62, 66, 68 f., 105, 112
 Gregory of Elvira, xxviii

 Habakkuk, 84
 Haggai, 84, 104
 Hamilton, 34
 Hammond, 37
 Harnack, xxxix
 Harris, Rendel, 20, 94
 Headlam, A. C., see Sanday
 Heaven, 34 f., 70 f.
 Hebrew idiom, 21, 23, 27, 29, 46, 63, 66 f., 84
 Hebrews, epistle to, author, xix ff., xxxix, 83; date, x, xl ff., liii f.; destination, x, xxxix f., xlix ff.; final blessing, x, xvii f., li, lxxxiii, 110; intensity, x, li, lxxxii, lxxxiv f., lxxxix f.; occasion, ix f., 1 f., lxxxvi; place of writing, liii, 112; position in N.T., xxiii; style, x, xxi, cxvi f.; title, xxx f., xl, 1 f.; use of O.T., civ f., 2 f., 8, 33, 89, 93
 Hegel, 84 ff.
 Hellenistic Judaism, xxxviii f., xlv, 1 ff., 72, 109
 Herbert, George, lxvi
 Hermas, Shepherd of, lxxxviii
 Herodotus, 44, 83
 Hesychius, 34

 High priest, cix, 23, 34
 Hilary of Poitiers, xxxii f.
 Hippolytus, xxviii f.
 Hogarth, 4
 Hope, lxxxvi, cxii ff., 85 f.
 Hort, xxiii, cv, cxxii ff., 12, 30, 35, 47, 79, 88, 108
 Hosea, cxiii, 2, 54, 60, 109
Hypostasis, 4, 28, 86

 S. Ignatius, 38
 Illumination, 43, 82
 Influence, lxii, lxxvii f., lxxx, lxxxiii
 Inheritance, xi, lvii ff., 3 f., 6 f.
 Intercession, lxviii, xci f., 51, 53
 Intermediate state, xcvi ff., 72
 S. Irenaeus, xxii
 Isaiah, 2, 20, 22, 29, 34, 66 f., 81, 84, 95, 99, 111
 Isocrates, 96

 S. James, xxviii, cxvi
 Jeremiah, lxxix ff., 2, 56, 59, 73, 75
 S. Jerome, xxiv, xxxii f.
 Jerusalem, xxxix f., xlii, xlv, lxxx, lxxxvi, 58, 101
 Jesus, the name of our Lord as man, xi f., xix, xli, xlv, lvii, lix, lxxv, 15 f., 18, 23, 32, 73, 78, 96, 110 f.
 Jesus = Joshua, 30, 32
 S. John, xxvii, xli, xlv, lxiii, lxv, lxxxviii, xciv f., civ, cxii f., cxvi, 2, 10, 17, 21, 60 f., 76, 78
 Josephus, liii f., 62
 Judgement, c f., 40, 42, 70 ff.

 Kenyon, cxxiv
 Kingdom of God, xvii, xli f., liv, lxxvi, lxxxiv f., lxxxviii, cxi f., 14, 16 f., 59, 104 f.
Kyrios, xlv, 14, 60

 Lake, K., xlv
 Last supper, lxxix f., xcii, 59

- Law, xvii, xxxvii, xl, lv, lvii,
 lxv, lxxxi f., lxxxvii, io, 13,
 51, 53, 64, 72
 Leaders, cxvii f., 106, 109
 Leighton, 100
 Leonian sacramentary, 98
 Levi, 49 ff., 65; testament of, 52
 Leviticus, lxx f., 20, 48, 50, 55,
 64
 Life enriched by death, lxxii ff.,
 68 f.
 Lightfoot, xxix, cxii, cxiv, 25,
 45, 103, 110
 Limborch, xxxvi f.
 Linus, xxv
 Literalism, xlv ff., lxxxviii f.
 Liturgy, English, lxiv, xcii, 72,
 97; Greek, 37, 60, 67, 110;
 Roman, xxvii
Logos, cix, 33 f.
 Lord's prayer, 23, 35, 71
 Lucretius, 12
 S. Luke, xxi, xxxiv, xxxix,
 lxxxvi, cxi, cxvi, 14, 38
 Luther, xxxix

 Maccabees, cx, 38, 50, 87, 94, 106
 Manhood and Godhead, xii f.,
 xxxvii f., lviii ff., lx, lxiii,
 lxv, 1 f., 5 f., 7, 15 ff., 78, 111
 Manifestation, xcv, 71
 Marcion, xxx
 Martyrdom, lxxxii, xcvi, xcvi, 16,
 23, 79, 83, 94 f., 106
 Maurice, F. D., xlvii, 43, 63, 83
 Mediation, lvi, lxv f., cix, 6, 13,
 53, 103 f.
 Melchizedek, xiv, lxvii f., cvii,
 cix, 29, 39 ff., 48 f.
 Ménégos, xxxv f.
 Messianic doctrine, xi, lxvi,
 cvii, 3, 5, 9, 40 f., 72, 84
 Millennium, xcix
 Milligan, G., xlvii
 Milligan, W., xlvii
 Milman, 3
 Milton, 5, 12
 Moffatt, xli, xlviii, cxviii
 Mommsen, canon, xxx

 Montanists, xxviii
 Moses, xiii, lxv, cvii, cxiv, 13,
 24 f., 59, 91 ff.
 Moulton, 46, 63
 Muratorian canon, xxix f.
 Murray, xcvi ff., 18
 Mystical principle, lxiv, lxxxv

 Nero, xxvi, liii, 83
 Nestorius, xxxvii f.
 Nicaea, council of, xxiii, xxxvii
 Novatian, xxviii

 Odes of Solomon, 20
 Order of words, cxxii, 18, 34,
 47, 50, 58, 61, 68, 74 f., 78 f.,
 85, 103
 Origen, xx ff., xxxii, lxxvii, 78

 Paget, F., lxi f.
 Pantaenus, xx
 Papyrus (p¹³), cxxiii, 26, 30 f.,
 37, 43
 Participles, cxix, 12, 19, 39,
 46, 50, 61, 67, 102
 Particles and conjunctions, 5,
 31, 34, 37, 62, 69, 71
 Patience, 97
 Patriotism, liv f., lxxx, cxiv
 S. Paul, xix ff., xli, xliii, xlv,
 lviii, lxi, lxxv f., lxxxiv f.,
 lxxxviii, xciii, xcvi f., xcix f.,
 cii ff., cxi, cxiii, cxvi, 17, 42,
 45, 81 f., 90, 109, 112
 Peake, xlviii
 Perfection, lix, lxiv, lxxvi f.,
 xcv ff., cii, 19 f., 52, 76 f., 95,
 111
 S. Peter, xxviii, xxxix, lviii,
 lxxiv, 79
 1 Peter, lv, xcvi, cxvi, 38, 47,
 67, 79, 104
 2 Peter, cxvi
 Pharisaic Judaism, 42
 Philip the deacon, xxxix
 Philo, xxxviii, xlv, lv, lxvii,
 lxxxix, civ, cvii ff., 3, 19 f.,
 25, 33 ff., 37, 39, 55, 58, 85 ff.,
 88, 90, 104

- Picturesque language, xiv, xvi f., lvi, lxiv, xci, cx, cxvii f., 1, 48 f., 61, 90, 96 f., 108
 Pindar, 20
 Plato, lxiv, cvi, cxi, cxv, 39, 57, 90, 106
 Pliny, 101
 Porphyry, 97
 Prepositions, 2, 10, 37, 89 f., 99, 112
 Priesthood, lv f., 36 f., 73, 76; Levitical, li, lvi f., lxvii, 23, 37, 50 ff., 61 f.; of Christ, x f., xiii ff., xviii, xxxvi, lxi, lxv ff., 16, 34 f., 54 f., 57; after the order of Melchizedek, xi, xiv, lxvii f., lxxii, 48 ff.
 Primasius, 62
 Priscilla, xxxix
 Prophecy, 2 f., 31 f., 74, 94
 Proverbs, 98
 Psalm II, xxvi, 8; VIII, lx, cv, 17 f.; XXII, 20, 63; XL, 73 ff.; XLV, 10; LXXXIX, 8, 92 f.; XCV, cv, 27 ff.; XCVII, 9; CII, 11; CIV, lx, 9 f.; CX, lxviii, 6, 37, 52 f., 56 f., 97
Psyche, 47
 Rabbinic Judaism, liv, 21 f., 35
 Ransom, xxxv, 67, cf. xxvi, 70
 Reconciliation, xxxvi, lxix, lxxi, cxx, 22
 Redemption, xxvi, lxxix, 66 f., 72
 Reformation, li f., 65
 Rendall, xlvi, 66
 Repentance, xxv, xlvi, lxxxvii ff., xciii ff., 39 f., 42, 80, 100 f.
 Rest of God, xiii, lxxxiv, cv, cxii, 30 ff.
 Resurrection, xlii, lviii, xcvi ff., cii f., 42, 94, 110
 Robinson, F., lxxxi f.
 Robinson, J. A., lxxxv, 80, 84
 Rome, x, xix, xxv, xxvii, xxix, xxxix f., 1, liii, lxxx, lxxxiv
 Rutherford, 19
 Rythm, cxxi f., 6, 61, 95, 99 f., 103
 Sacramental principle, xviii, xlvii, lxi ff., lxxxv, ciii, cvii, cx f., 17, 52, 79, 107 f.
 Sacrifice, x f., xv, xxxvi, xlix, lxxi, lxxxii, 36 f., 91 f.; in O.T., x f., xv, li, lvi f., lxxxii, 61 f., 108 f.; of Christ, xv ff., xxvii, xxxv ff., lxi, xc, 55, 61 f., 65 f., 108 f.; re-enacted in the faithful, xc ff., cxii, 76 f., 108
 Sacrifices, xxvii, 109
 Saints, xcvi, 45, 54, 95, 103
 Salvation, lii, lxxviii, 12 ff., 72
 Sanctification, lxxxiii f., cxx, 11, 75 f., 100
 Sanday, 10, 21
 Sanday and Headlam, lxix, lxxv, 12
 Sardinia, xxxi
 Satan, ci, 21 f.
 Schweitzer, lxi ff.
 Self, lxxiii, lxxvi, 83
 Selwyn, 102
¹Septuagint (LXX), lxxix f., 9, 17, 19, 27, 29, 74 f., 84, 100
 Sermon on the Mount, liv
 Servant of the LORD, lxxii, 72
 Shadow and type, xxxvii, xlvii, li, lvi f., lxxi f., 58, 73 f.
 Sheol, 22
 Sickness, 35, 97
 Silas, xxxix
 Sin, sinlessness, lii, lix f., lxxiv, lxxviii, xciii ff., 28, 35, 37, 80 f., 96 f.
 Sinai, xvii, 10, 13, 101 f.
 Sirach, xxii, ci, 53, 68, 88
 Socinians, xxxvi
 Socrates, 47, 86
 Soul, lxxi, 47, 84 f.

¹ The LXX chapters &c. do not always correspond with the Hebrew or the English Bible. Thus Ps. xcvi (xcvi) = Ps. xcvi in LXX, xcvi in Hebrew and English.

- Souter, xxix, xxxi, lxxiv, cxxiv
 Spirit, xlvii, cv f., cxi, cxvii,
 12, 15, 17, 21, 31, 40, 43, 62,
 65, 67, 78, 81
 Spirits, xcv ff., ci f., 9, 12, 21,
 96, 99
 Statius, 35
 S. Stephen, xxxix, xlii, 42, 93
 Strong, 5
 Suffering, lxii, lxxiv, 15 f., 35,
 38, 71, 97
 Swete, 15, 21, 50
 Symmachus, 62
 Synagogue, 80

 Tabernacle, xl, lxv, 56 f., 61 ff.,
 65, 67
 Tacitus, 63
 Targum of Onkelos, 81
 Temple, xl, 1, lxv, 12
 Temptation, lxxvi, lxxxvi, 23,
 93, 95
 Tenses, lxxxiii f., xci f., xcvi,
 cxvii, cxix, 6, 12, 18 f., 30, 39,
 57 f., 61, 64, 66 f., 75 f., 86,
 90, 110
 Tertullian, xix, xxiv f., 43
 Text, xxiv, cxxii ff., 3, 6, 10,
 19, 27, 29 ff., 37, 42 f., 45, 57,
 60 f., 64 ff., 83, 88, 93, 97 f.,
 99, 107, 111; received, cxxii,
 88, 107, 111; western, 81 f.;
 Westcott and Hort's, xxiii,
 cxxii ff., 66
 Theodotion, 82, 94
 Theology and religion, lxxxif.,
 cf. 44
 Tradition, xxxii, cii f., cxv, 3,
 13, 26, 43, 59

 Trench, 65
 Trent, council of, xxxiv

 Ulpian, 101

 Vaughan, C. J., xlv
 Vaughan, Henry, 78
 Versions, xxiii f., xxxi, cxxiii;
 A.V. and R.V., cxviii; earlier
 English, 5, 78; Egyptian.
 xxiii, cxxiii; modern English,
 cxviii; Old Latin, xxxi, cxxiii,
 22; Syriac, xxiii, cxxiii, 99;
 Vulgate, xxiii, xxxi, cxxiii,
 22, 29, 53, 88, 92, 97, 102,
 105, 109
 Virgil, 88, 105

 Wallace, 87
 Westcott, xxiii, xxix ff., xlix,
 cxxii ff., 3, 46, 58, 66, 78,
 84
 Wetstein, xl, 32
 Wickham, xlv, cxvi f.
 Will, xii, lxiii, lxxii, lxxxii ff.,
 65, 70 f., 72 ff., 83, 92, 110 f.
 Windisch, xlv ff., lxxxvii ff.,
 52, 85
 Wisdom, xxii, cix f., 2, 4 f., 21,
 34, 72, 88
 Word, lxvii, cviii f., 5, 32 ff.
 World ("other," "to come"),
 lxvii, lxxxvi, cxi f., 4, 16 f.,
 74, 86, 89
 Wrede, xx

 Zahn, xxiv
 Zealots, liii
 Zechariah, 78, 111

Bible

Comment(N.T.)

Heb.

N

169105

Hebrews, Epistle to the

Nairne, Alexander (ed.)

The Epistle to the Hebrews in the
Revised Version.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket

Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"

Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

